

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 475

EA 013 300

AUTHOR Berg, Donna Lee
TITLE Teachers' Centres: A Report Based on the Literature.
INSTITUTION Commission on Declining School Enrolments in Ontario, Toronto.
REPORT NO CODE-IB-11
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 159p.: Appendices may not reproduce clearly due to small print of original document. For related documents, see EA 013 260-308.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Centre, Ministry of Government Services, 880 Bay St., 5th Floor, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario M7A 1N8 Canada (Record No. ON01447/CODE00310: \$1.50 microfiche).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *Comparative Analysis; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Foreign Countries; Governance; Inservice Teacher Education; *Literature Reviews; *Organizational Climate; Social Life; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Great Britain; Ontario; *United States

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on the British concept of teachers' centers. Emphasis has been placed on the literature that analyzes the effect of political, social, economic, and cultural factors on the development of centers. Part 1 of the report discusses British teachers' centers in some detail. Part 2 presents an overview of United States centers set up as a result of American educators' enthusiastic acceptance of the British concept. This section attempts to highlight the differences in implementation of the basic philosophy within a totally different educational environment. In part 3, British and American centers are jointly discussed in relation to certain aspects that involve either common concerns or demonstrate the differences in attitude between the two nations concerning evaluation and research, curriculum development, inservice training, and the future of centers. Ontario's limited involvement with teachers' centers is discussed in part 3 and a brief commentary is made on the province's educational policy, particularly as it relates to curriculum. (Author/MLF)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED197475

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INFORMATION BULLETIN NO. 11

TEACHERS' CENTRES:
A REPORT BASED ON THE LITERATURE

DONNA LEE BERG

JUNE, 1978

✓

EA 013 300

COMMISSION ON DECLINING ENROLMENTS IN ONTARIO (CODE)

R. W. B. JACKSON
COMMISSIONER

H. B. HENDERSON
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V8

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. M. Hildebrand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TEACHERS' CENTRES:

A REPORT BASED ON THE LITERATURE

DONNA LEE BERG

This paper was commissioned by and prepared for the Commission on Declining School Enrolments in Ontario and is not to be cited or quoted without the permission of the Commission and the author.

This study reflects the views of the author and not necessarily those of the Commission or the Ministry of Education.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
DEFINITION	8
PHILOSOPHY	9
 PART I - THE BRITISH EXPERIENCE	
1. Rationale	10
2. Historical Background	11
3. Facilities and Equipment	17
4. Governance and Finance	21
5. Staffing and the Role of the Warden	28
6. Function and Activities	33
a) Curriculum Development	35
b) In-Service Training	45
c) Induction Training	52
d) Social	54
e) Resources and Services	56
7. Users	61
8. Relationship with Other Organizations and Institutions	64
 PART II - THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE	
1. Rationale	71
2. Historical Background	73
3. The American Environment	77
4. Types of Centres - Activities, Governance and Finance	87

	<u>Page</u>
 PART III - BRITISH AND AMERICAN CENTRES - CURRENT ISSUES	
1. Evaluation and Research	91
2. Chicken or the Egg - Curriculum Development or In-Service Training	95
3. The Future of Teachers' Centres and Teacher/Teaching Centers	101
 PART IV - THE ONTARIO EXPERIENCE	
1. Historical Background	108
2. The Ontario Environment	118
CONCLUDING REMARKS	122
 APPENDICES	
I Brochure from Enfield Teachers' Centre, September 1974	129
II OTF. The Current State of Teacher Centre Development in Ontario, October 1976	137
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 146

INTRODUCTION

This report focuses on the British concept of teachers' centres. It is based primarily on British and American journal articles, reports and papers written during the past ten years. Some Canadian references are included which were largely extracted from files generously made available by the Ontario Teachers' Federation.

American literature, especially since 1972, is voluminous. A computer search of the ERIC data base produced some 285 journal articles and reports. American references were selected either because they analyzed or reported on the British model, or because they demonstrated the differences in rationale, objectives, implementation or educational environment between the two nations.

Throughout the report, the British generic term "teachers' centre" is used, except when a specific reference or quotation is used from the American or Canadian literature.

The influence of literature on the growth of centres, particularly in the United States, is worth noting. British centres had expanded rapidly as the result of a brief paper published by the Schools Council in 1967 (Working Paper No. 10) which encouraged local education authorities to establish (LEA) centres where teachers could participate in local curriculum development. Previous to that time centres had existed, but most had been set up in relation to specific projects

or issues. A number had developed from the curriculum projects of the Nuffield Foundation which sought feedback and revision from working groups of teachers at the local level. Centres had also been established in secondary schools to consider the implications of raising the school leaving age (ROSLA), while others had resulted from the participation of teachers in the Certificate of Secondary Education (CSE) syllabus or consideration of programs for new comprehensive schools.

While the LEA's* continued to enthusiastically establish centres, few articles appeared in the journal literature and most reports were based on Schools Council surveys or conferences. One such publication worthy of special attention is Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6, Teachers' Centres and the Changing Curriculum, published in 1970. The paper reported on three national conferences held in 1969. The conferences raised a number of questions, many of which have still not been resolved. For that very reason, however, it remains one of the most valuable documents on teachers' centres. Although frequently referred to or quoted, it is often used to support a particular point of view; it needs to be read in its entirety to fully understand some of the practical problems of implementing an ideal.

On the other side of the Atlantic, an article appeared in the November, 1971 issue of Phi Delta Kappan which triggered the growth of both centres and literature in the United States, and contributed to the growth of the literature

* Local Education Authorities

in Britain. The article, "Teachers' Centers: A British First", was written by Stephen K. Bailey, then chairman of the Policy Institute, Syracuse University Research Corporation. He spoke in glowing terms of the British concept of classroom teachers as "prime movers". Bailey put into words the rationale by which the centres, as he saw it, had been established -

- "1) Fundamental educational reform will come only through those charged with the basic educational responsibility: to wit, the teachers;
- 2) teachers are unlikely to change their ways of doing things just because imperious, theoretical reformers - whether successions of Richovers or Illiches or high-powered R & D missionaries from central educational systems - tell them to shape up;
- 3) teachers will take reform seriously only when they are responsible for defining their own educational problems, delineating their own needs and receiving help on their own terms and turf."¹

American educators responded by rushing to Britain to view and report enthusiastically on British centres and the autonomy of the British teacher. Although the U.S. Office of Education was already involved in promoting a type of

¹ Bailey's words are quoted in full because they are frequently paraphrased, usually with discrete elimination of the references to Richover and Illich.

"teacher center", it appears to have been Bailey's article which was largely responsible for the proliferation of centres funded privately or at the state or local level. The article also had its influence in Ontario where it resulted in the establishment of several centres at the initiative of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, followed by a conference jointly sponsored by the Ontario Teachers' Federation and OISE.

Coincidentally, in December of 1971, a feature article entitled "Centres for Action" by Auriol Stevens appeared in the Times Educational Supplement which predicted that the "peaceful obscurity" of the centres would not last. She was not, however, referring to the onslaught of American and foreign visitors which were to descend on British centres, but to the likelihood that the James Committee, set up under the chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme to examine teacher education and training, would recommend greater use of teachers' centres as bases for in-service and probationary year training. Beyond these expectations, the James Committee, in its 1972 report, suggested a network of professional centres which it implied might or might not be based on existing teachers' centres.

As a part of an ongoing trans-Atlantic tennis match, there then appeared in 1973 in Britain a highly influential book, Teachers' Centres, which was subsequently published in the United States in 1974. Edited by Robert Thornbury, the articulate warden of Sherbrook Teachers' Centre in London, it included four chapters written by Thornbury himself dealing with

the growth, history, influences and future direction of teachers' centres. Strongly supportive of the autonomy of local centres, Thornbury viewed almost all other agencies as a threat to this concept, and was particularly concerned by what he perceived as the looming "iceberg of centralism". The balance of the chapters in the book were written by centre wardens and, in general, outlined the problems and features of different types of teachers' centres.

Two of these wardens, Harry Kahn of Enfield and Robert Gough of Rachel Macmillan Centres, have had considerable influence in promoting international admiration for the teachers' centre concept, both through their writings and the fact that their centres have been most frequently viewed by overseas visitors. Kahn, indeed, was guest speaker at a conference on teachers' centres held in Toronto in 1973.

Although undoubtedly the primary reason for Thornbury's book was a defence of centres against the implied threat of centralization and their uncertain future suggested by the James report, he and his colleagues may also have been influenced by the sudden spotlight of American and other foreign interest. The fact that the foreword to the American edition of Thornbury's book was written by Edward Yeomans, Director of the Greater Boston Teacher Center, and that Thornbury's first paragraph makes note of the growing number of visits by foreign educationalists, is scarcely coincidental.

British literature appears to be largely dominated by those directly involved with the operation of centres which may

tend to bias any consideration of their success. In viewing British centres, it is difficult not to quote Thornbury and his colleagues extensively and, even when they are not quoted directly, one is aware of their influence in the literature, much of which has been written since the book's publication.

Any report based solely on the literature quite naturally has its limitations. There is a danger of giving equal consideration to all references regardless of the writer's competency, and quotations taken out of context can give undue importance to minor points of view. It is obvious that in dealing with a concept such as teachers' centres, where so little exists in the way of research and evaluation, caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions from the literature.

Part I of the report discusses British teachers' centres in some detail. Part II presents an overview of U.S. centres set up as a result of American educators' enthusiastic acceptance of the British concept. This section attempts to highlight the differences in implementation of the basic philosophy within a totally different educational environment. In Part III, British and American centres are jointly discussed in relation to certain aspects which involve either common concerns or which once again demonstrate the differences in attitude between the two nations (i.e., evaluation and research, curriculum development and in-service training, the future of centres). Ontario's limited involvement with teachers' centres is discussed in Part III and a brief

commentary is made on the province's educational policy, particularly as it relates to curriculum.

It is hoped that this report, based on the literature, will point out the positive and negative aspects of teachers' centres and suggest certain areas which might be the subject of more intensive investigation. Emphasis has been placed on the literature which analyzes the effect of political, social, economic and cultural factors on the development of centres since, in the final analysis, these are the constraints within which a philosophy is implemented.

DEFINITION

The British "teachers' centre" and the American "teacher center" or "teaching center" indicate more than the spelling idiosyncracies of the two nations. The words are also representative of basic differences in attitude. The deliberate use of the "s" apostrophe in the British title reinforces the idea of a centre which belongs to teachers. The more impersonal "teacher center" or "teaching center" implies a centre for teachers, but not necessarily belonging to them. These latter terms are, in fact, largely used to describe training or resource (materials) centres in the United States.

On the other hand, the British term appears to consistently refer to the ideology of a publicly funded organization, majority governed by teachers, which places responsibility in the hands of teachers for their own in-service training and curriculum development on a voluntary basis. Although this concept has gained wide acceptance in principle in the United States, doubts have been expressed as to whether any true "teachers' centre", duplicating the British model, exists in North America.

The confusion, incidentally, is compounded by the Canadian tendency to compromise with a middle-ground term "teacher centre".

PHILOSOPHY

The philosophy for the establishment of teachers' centres, teacher centers or teaching centers has been variously stated on both sides of the Atlantic. Briefly, in both Britain and the United States, it is based on the belief that fundamental educational reform or change will only come about through the efforts of those charged with the basic educational responsibility - the classroom teachers.

The philosophy seems to reflect a dissatisfaction with the top-down, system-wide structure and provides a local facility for school-based, small group or individual in-service education and/or curriculum development.

However, the interpretation of this philosophy and the degree to which teachers are given direct responsibility for programs varies widely, especially in the United States. The British teachers' centre, on the other hand, appears, at least in principle, to be committed to the premise that teachers have the expertise and experience to identify their own needs in these areas and to assume responsibility for initiating and implementing programs.

PART I - THE BRITISH EXPERIENCE

1. RATIONALE

Within the basic philosophic framework of teachers as the primary implementers of educational change, British teachers' centres have evolved based on the following rationale:

- a) teachers are professionals "involved both in deciding what is needed and in providing it"
 - b) teachers' centres provide a neutral, readily accessible meeting ground for teachers and educationalists in the area they serve
 - c) teachers' centres provide flexibility which ensures that programs can be fitted to local needs
- (Kahn 1975)

What is perhaps most remarkable in British centres is that, in spite of their widespread differences, there is a common commitment to this philosophy and rationale. As Bender (1975) observed "if nothing else is present in centers, teacher control is present". Another American observer commented "the basic principle which gives the British teacher center its uniqueness and power as an educational tool is the insistence that the centers function by and for teachers". (De Vault 1974b)

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

From a handful in 1960, British teachers' centres increased to 270 in 1967, 450 in 1970 and 617 in 1972 (Thornbury 1974). Current count is open to debate, but the Times Educational Supplement reported some 545 in August of 1977 (Self 1977).

Thornbury identified a number of factors in the 1960's which initiated centres:

- i) Nuffield Foundation projects involved teachers at the local level in the production of curriculum materials. Numerous centres had their beginnings in this way
- ii) comprehensive schools emerged which created their own teachers' centres to carry on school-based curriculum development
- iii) scores of new LEA's were created in the reorganization of local government and teachers' centres were set up as neutral ground where teachers and administrators could meet
- iv) in city core areas, centres with social facilities were created as a "fringe benefit" to attract young teachers and to support the exceptionally high turnover.
- v) rapid change in teaching requirements created a need for "hard" teaching skills which could be acquired locally, e.g., use of A/V hardware, new math, changes in science curricula, metrification, etc.
- vi) successive educational reports urged expansion of in-service training. The influential Plowden Committee praised the idea of local teachers' centres.

vii) the establishment of the Schools Council¹ in 1962, an independent organization with LEA's and teachers acting as partners. In 1964, in its Working Paper No. 2, the Council recommended local development centres where teachers could think through the problems of ROSLA (raising of the school leaving age). Most influential in the development of centres was the Council's publication of Working Paper No. 10 in 1967 which Thornbury referred to as "the little red pamphlet". Its few pages provided the basis for the proliferation of teachers' centres.

a) Schools Council Working Paper No. 10

The Council's primary concern was curriculum development which is discussed in detail later in this report. Briefly, the paper encouraged curriculum development and review at the local level by teachers. In-service training, although not the primary objective, was also seen as a need in order to give increasing prominence to newly developed materials. To these ends, the Council encouraged local education authorities to set up teachers' centres. It left decisions as to location, equipment, staffing, etc. to the discretion of authorities, but made certain specific suggestions -

- i) for economic reasons, a centre should probably not serve a teaching population of less than 400 or more than 800

¹The chairman of the Schools Council is appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science with a governing council of 66 members from various teacher associations and LEA's. Its constitution provides that "at least a majority of the members of the governing council shall be teachers".

- ii) centres based on or adjacent to a school, technical college or college of education would have certain advantages in sharing facilities such as labs, lecture rooms and workshops
- iii) use in the evening and weekend should develop rapidly but day use would depend on policies of individual authorities
- iv) the appointment of a full-time leader was encouraged. Part-time leaders might be used in multi-purpose centres. Salaries of leaders would fall within range of college of education heads of departments scale
- v) a small steering committee would be desirable "with as full as possible a representation of local teacher opinion"
- vi) whatever part of authorities' capital expenditures could be spared should be devoted to remodelling or renovation of existing premises

b) The James Committee

"The report on Teacher Education and Training presented to the Secretary of State (Mrs. Thatcher) in time for her Christmas lunch in December, 1971 was promptly christened 'the James tricycle'." (Thornbury 1974) The report recommended that teachers be educated in three consecutive cycles - personal education, pre-service training and induction, and in-service training, with the greatest emphasis

on the latter.

In conjunction with in-service training, the committee, headed by Lord James of Rusholme, recommended a country-wide network of "professional centres" which would include not only the colleges and departments of education, but also a number of other centres, based on existing facilities and in some cases developed from teachers' centres. All centres should have a full-time warden, together with support staff. Centres based on professional institutions would normally be approved for a wide range of 3rd cycle facilities, including most of the longer full-time courses and should also be involved in training of "licensed teachers" in the second year of the 2nd cycle (probationary teaching with a reduced timetable). Professional centres based elsewhere (i.e., locally-based centres) "should make the 2nd cycle provision for which they were approved and some, subject to meeting certain standards, should also be involved with both induction and in-service training".

c) The Government White Paper

The government White Paper, Education: A Framework for Expansion (1972), disagreed with the proposals for initial training of teachers but it endorsed the recommendation that young teachers needed special help and support. As will be noted in the section on "Induction Training", the government established two pilot induction schemes in 1973/74 based on existing teachers' centres. The government also accepted the

concept of a sabbatical every seven years and recommended substantial expansion of in-service training beginning 1974/75 to achieve 3% release of teachers by 1981.

d) Professional Centres

The implementation of professional centres remains in abeyance, although some authorities such as the Surrey School Council reportedly considered a two-tier system with retention of all but one or two current teachers' centres as presently organized; the latter would be converted to professional centres (Mulhern 1976).

In 1976, the Times Educational Supplement (Stevens and Cohen) reported on a meeting of the James Committee to evaluate the progress, if any, of the report. One member commented that if not for the financial crisis, the 3rd cycle would have been established, although "whether there would have been a network of professional centres and tutors he was less sure". In hindsight, a committee member suggested that the report should have been more threatening and less reasonable - "the success of many of the James recommendations depended on recognizing the need for teachers was going to decline and that ratios would be improved to allow for the expansion of in-service training and the introduction of induction". Lord James himself admitted the report "might have made a clearer statement on numbers, but trying to get accurate figures from the DES was like trying to get blood out of a stone". However, he emphasized that in-service training was "the primary objective, our number one priority to which everything else must be sacrificed".

Some wardens saw the proposed expansion of professional centres as an academic threat to grassroots teaching and as a potential toward bureaucratic centralism in curriculum control and in-service training (Julius 1976b).

As Rosner (1972) commented "it should be noted that the individuality of each center is a mark of pride among wardens, for the centers reflect the variability and individuality of British life in general and British education in particular".

Mulhern (1976) viewed the proposed professional centres as a "most intriguing" intermediary between the college and the school districts providing "teaching practice for a person finishing college, consultant service and orientation for first year teachers, and in-service work for practicing teachers". He concluded with a remark that would probably bring dismay to the heart of any British warden - "there is no question but that some of the more successful teachers' centers in the States are closer to being professional centers than they are teachers' centers in the English model ..."

3. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

What is a teachers' centre? Bender (1975) described it simply as:

"A place for teachers to meet professionally and socially. It is usually away from school, has a leader, often called a warden, has a work area and places to sit, work, read and talk, provisions for coffee and tea, is run for and by teachers with the cooperation of others and is probably supported by the Local Education Authority."

Within this framework, however, centres vary widely. Some have space in schools, others are housed in colleges of education, some in separate buildings which may even be large enough to offer residential facilities. Some centres are in fact peripatetic, as in Cornwall, where Roseveare (1974) reported on the residential centre which established itself during the winter in resort hotels at out-of-season rates.

There are a variety of opinions on where a centre should best be located. Kahn (1974), in discussing his centre at Enfield, emphasized the benefits of the non-school setting of a separate building and commented "in furnishing the centre care was taken to create an adult atmosphere which would be different to the school environment in which teachers worked all day enabling them to relax in pleasant surroundings".

A Schools Council questionnaire in 1968 reported that out of 308 centres in existence at that time, 113 were based in school buildings. Most of these were attached to primary

schools and 89 had been set up in conjunction with Nuffield or Schools Council projects in mathematics, science or modern languages.

The 1972 NUT (National Union of Teachers) Survey, which had a 35% response from wardens, found that by 1971 three-quarters of teachers' centres were accommodated in separate buildings. This was true especially in the cities, although there was a tendency for specialist centres to be located in schools. Rural centres were smaller, averaging three rooms, had less equipment, and were more thinly spread than urban centres which had an average of seven rooms available for use.

Thornbury's book, Teachers' Centres (1974), described centres with different types of facilities and activities -

Geoffrey Matthews, Shell Professor of Mathematics Education, Chelsea College, University of London, discussed centres which had their origins in the Nuffield mathematics project. Fourteen pilot areas were set up, but seventy-seven second phase areas were soon established, followed by forty-four continuation areas. Three main elements were found in each of the centres - a working room for teachers to try out materials and to make their own; a comfortably furnished discussion room, usually including a library; and a refreshment area.

Harry Kahn described Enfield's facilities in a "bungalow-type building" which had been vacated as a result of the introduction of comprehensive education; it had formerly served as a craft annex to a school which had been moved. Space

included a lecture room seating up to 200; a workshop to accommodate 30; a library-TV room; a lounge and server; and office space for the warden and his secretary. The centre also included a wide range of reprographic equipment and audio-visual aids.

Burnely Centre, one of fifteen originally established to facilitate the North West Regional Curriculum Development Project, was described by its warden, Bill Greenwood. The centre at that time consisted of one small room in an elementary school which could accommodate only a small office, tables for twelve people, and duplicating equipment. Of necessity, many meetings took place in various local schools. Greenwood considered the limited facilities not altogether a bad thing, emphasizing that resource banks and reprographic systems are only elements but the actual process is people. The close contact with schools encouraged this process - "a mendicant friar" is more likely to cause change than an "institutionalized bishop".

In contrast to these limited facilities, Bob Gough described Rachel McMillan Teachers' Centre in Southwark, London. Located in a college of education, Gough as warden, had a joint appointment to the faculty as a lecturer. The building was shared with the college and used as an annex for part-time teacher training courses for mature students during the day and was available as a teachers' centre after 4:00 p.m. Gough pointed out that the dual function made for an effective use of plant. The media centre and library were also shared which gave teachers access to an excellent collection of

resources. The main disadvantage was that teachers were initially reluctant to have anything to do with something labelled "college of education". Gough felt it was essential in such a setting for the warden to have a designated and significant role in the college.

Roseveare described the two-tier system in Cornwall which included the peripatetic residential centre mentioned above. This facility provided teachers with free accommodations and travel expenses, and "a replacement teacher is available for all primary teachers and most secondary teachers". Of the fourteen local rural centres, all appeared to be located in schools, with six having accommodations not used by schools in the day-time.

4. GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

Most British teachers' centres are financed and maintained by local education authorities, but they are generally run by a steering or advisory committee dominated by teachers (Stevens 1971).

LEA's, which succeeded school boards in 1903, were restricted originally to county and county borough councils; London boroughs were added in 1965. The authorities are under the control and direction of the Secretary of State for Education and Science, with financial assistance provided through the Department of Education and Science. Her Majesty's Inspectors, officials of the Department, are responsible for ensuring that established national standards are met by local authorities. Bender (1975) observed that, in the past, HMI's carried more weight, but their role now tends to be largely advisory. He also observed the strong position of school heads who exercise considerable control over schools and, thus, over centres' functions - "it has been the heads who released teachers for center work and who permitted and encouraged the use of centers".

Blishen (1970) noted that "LEA's, voluntary bodies and teachers, mainly through their national organizations, play a prominent part in the formulation of national policy and are consulted by the Secretary of State on all matters of importance before he takes decisions". The LEA is required to appoint an education committee to which it may delegate all its powers relating to education except the power to borrow money or raise the rate. The authorities have a chief

education officer and a group of advisers who act chiefly in the capacity of consultants.

Pilcher (1973) pointed out the attitude of trust which appears to pervade British education has contributed in large measure to the success of the teachers' centre concept. LEA's are reticent to interfere in internal school affairs, assuming these are best left to professional educators. Similarly, British head teachers grant greater autonomy to classroom teachers than American principals, possibly because of less pressure for public accountability. Parents also appear less prone to criticize school officials on the premise that they know what they are doing. Pilcher felt that the British system allowed freedom from waging a constant battle over tax support based on local funds "since funding for local schools comes from the national government".

Julius (1976b) also mentioned that British teachers and administrators are respected, trusted and shielded from local influences because of national funding procedures - "they are not subservient to the community in a hierarchical system dependent on local tax support for financing".

One of the earliest teachers' centres set up by an LEA was the Martineau Centre in Birmingham, opened in 1952 and established largely as a social centre to cope with teacher shortage. A house was bought and converted by the authority and teachers were charged a yearly subscription for such amenities as a tea-room, lounge, an inner bar leading to a glass-covered terrace and gardens, a smoking room, a sitting

room, a library, and music, craft and drama rooms. The centre's two original functions are now separated with the Martineau Club paying rent to the LEA and the teachers' centre financed by the education committee (Thompson 1972).

Schools Council Working Paper No. 10 (1967) emphasized that centre programs must reflect the thinking of teachers themselves and that the representation of teachers' views was essential from the first stage of setting up a centre. It suggested a small steering committee "with as full as possible a representation of local teacher development".

In its analysis of three national conferences, the Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6 (1970) reiterated that, in the experience of successful centres, the initial involvement of teachers and teacher organizations and their majority representation on steering committees was essential. However, as funding had to be obtained from LEA's, there was a need to closely involve the authority from the early stages of planning, possibly through an education officer or adviser who could present the case to the education committee.

Arrangements for administering the centre on a day-to-day basis vary, but, in general, a small management committee composed of six to eighteen members to advise or direct the warden was seen as reasonable (Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6). Once again, at least one LEA representative served on the committee. In some cases, a representative of the local college of education (which also come under the jurisdiction of LEA's) was involved.

The Schools Council questionnaire administered in 1968

found that in the total of 308 reporting centres, control in the main was "firmly in the hands of teachers". On management committees, they outnumbered local education authority officials and education committee representatives in the ratio of 5 to 2.

American researcher, Julius (1976b), questioned the actual extent of teacher control and observed that the power of the managing committee varied from centre to centre - "the 'kingpin' may be the district adviser or the warden, in spite of the fact that theoretically the committee could override them". She observed that "ultimate control resides in the LEA since this agency is the main source of funding. The centre proposed a budget and programs which compete for money with other programs and units." However, the same might be said for any organization in relation to its source of funding. The degree of autonomy appears to be a matter of the extent to which the agency allocating funds chooses to exercise its "clout".

Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6 (1970) remarked "where centres have been successfully established in this way, it was agreed that the local education authorities' role had been largely one of ongoing, tactful, sympathetic advice".

Kahn (1974) described the setting up of Enfield Centre, located in one of the 32 Greater London Boroughs. The borough had a joint consultative committee, comprised in equal parts of representatives of the education committee and the teachers' committee. It was the members of the latter committee

together with the borough's dozen or so advisers who eventually convinced the education committee to set up a centre. A working party of advisers and teachers' committee members investigated possible buildings and assisted in renovating space for centre use. The centre advisory committee under the chairmanship of the chief - education officer consisted of the education officer - secondary, the education officer - primary, five teacher representatives appointed by the Teachers' Committee, the vice principal of the local college of education, the warden (as secretary), and the advisers (as non-voting members).

Canadian educators, Jones and Stabler (1972), reported in a memo following a visit to Enfield that the warden felt the committee worked well, but was not ideal because teacher representatives were usually teacher politicians. They also visited North Ealing Centre which had both management and executive committees. The warden, in this case, reported that committees tended to be passive, meeting once each term, accepting his reports, and offering minimal direction.

Mulhern (1976) visited three areas and described their committee structures -

Cheshire had eight centres. Each centre had a warden nominated by the local steering committee of 12 members - 2 representatives of professional co-ordinating committee, 2 primary teachers, 2 secondary teachers, 2 college representatives and 4 education authorities persons.

Cornwall had a 2-tier system with fourteen teachers' centres. A county-wide Central Academic Board served as the coordinating unit of centres and consisted of one teacher representative from each centre, 3 college representatives, 3 county authority representatives and 3 wardens, with voting membership solely with teacher members. Policy recommendations were passed to a small working party of the education committee and teachers, who in turn made recommendations to the further education committee, who then referred them to the education committee. Each local teachers' centre was governed by a local academic board consisting of 12 teachers - 6 primary and 6 secondary.

Surrey on the other hand had established a Surrey Schools Council which had preceded the establishment of centres. It had 12 teacher members appointed for three-year terms from a list of nominations by teacher associations and inspectorate. The area had eleven centres including one residential; all but one operated with a part-time warden.

A 1971 NUT survey reported annual budgets at that time for rural centres averaged \$1600 and for urban, \$9,000 with two centres having budgets exceeding \$50,000 (McKeegan 1977).

Rosner (1972) reported that budgets for day-to-day operations, excluding permanent staff, ranged from \$2,000 to \$8,000 per year, although he admitted that these figures were not reliable. He noted that, while centres were funded by LEA's, some got income from commercial publishers in exchange for production and distribution rights to materials and equipment developed at the centre.

Rosner attempted to calculate the cost of replicating a British model in New York City based on rental of 7500 square feet; a full-time director and secretary; a half-time deputy director, media-specialist and librarian; plus custodial, clerical and consulting assistance. He concluded that at the time of writing, a centre servicing approximately 1,000 teachers might cost \$250,000 per year, or \$250 per teacher. However, his calculations included rental of \$37,500 per annum and personnel costs of \$115,000 including fringe benefits, both of which are undoubtedly higher than those of any British centre. Obviously, given the number of variables present, it is extremely difficult to suggest an average figure for a centre.

5. STAFFING AND THE ROLE OF THE WARDEN

In the 1968 Schools Council survey, the majority of the 308 centres then in existence relied on the voluntary leadership of teachers and some part-time paid assistance; there were 101 part-time appointments either as secretary, warden, leader or co-ordinator. However, there were already at that time 63 full-time "wardens", the term which is most frequently applied to the individual responsible for the management of a teachers' centre. In addition, a number of LEA's indicated that such an appointment was pending or seriously being considered. Three-quarters of centres' staff was either practicing or former teachers, with the balance mainly secretarial and clerical assistance.

The 1972 NUT survey received response from only 35% of centres questioned; however, results showed that two-thirds of the wardens were paid as teachers at the "Burnham" salary scales, while the remainder were paid "on a confused mixture of college of education, inspectorate and administrative scales". Most wardens received a car allowance for visiting schools. Teachers' centres often had assisting staff, such as secretaries and caretakers, but only thirteen had appointed deputy wardens. The number of staff varied widely in relation to size, facilities and activities of the centres.

Thornbury (1974) observed that "one large teachers' centre employed a host of estate workers, gardeners, cooks, cleaners and clerical staff, as well as five barmen and fifteen waitresses." Obviously such manor house luxuries are the exception rather

than the rule.

McKeegan (1977) surveyed fifty-eight wardens attending a national conference in 1974 and found 85% were employed full-time.

Schools Council Working Paper No. 10 (1967) suggested that a centre in full operation would find it difficult to be effective without one full-time leader. It admitted it might be difficult for an authority to find or spare teachers with "the personal qualities, skill and experience for this work". Such an individual would be "responsible for co-ordinating all and initiating some of the local work. He would be available for some evenings and weekends for continuous courses, discussion groups and seminars for which he was particularly responsible. During the daytime the leader would need to be available to offer working assistance with new work in schools and from time to time for the planning and arrangement of future programmes of group or centre work."

At first reading, this brief statement seems innocuous enough, but, in actual fact, it implies an almost unrealistic expectation of expertise, initiative, energy and dedication.

Most articles or reports relating to teachers' centres emphasize the importance of the warden. The Schools Council report of three national conferences (Pamphlet No. 10 1970) found at its most unsatisfactory, the warden's role was "a general 'dogsbody' with duties ranging from summarizing schools council working papers to washing up cups and saucers". Another view was that the warden's function should

be mainly administrative - "the person who sets up everything for the teachers and then faded into the background". The more widely held view was that he should be someone who could provide leadership "because he was a good teacher with the kind of qualifications and experience needed in some crucial area of work being fostered by the centre". However, there was fear expressed that this might force the warden into a role closely duplicating an LEA adviser. The conference also suggested that wardens needed "greater expertise in group discussion work, a sound understanding of behavioural psychology, of the work done in curriculum planning, of related fields of sociology, and a working knowledge of resources and information needed by teachers".

McKeegan's (1977) survey of fifty-eight wardens showed that only 17% had experience limited to classroom teaching; most had previous administrative experience, usually as heads of departments or deputy headmasters.

Training for wardens has been of increasing concern as recognition has grown of the complexity of their role. Walton (1972) felt wardens frequently did not have the respect of secondary teachers because they lacked status. He suggested this could be remedied by special training, especially relating to curriculum studies.

In a different vein, Beresford (1974) commented that "in the last four years the emphasis on process skills has become increasingly clear.. There must be few wardens left who are not au fait with the term 'catalyst' and 'facilitator', or

who have not at some time talked about 'creating a flexible environment to meet the needs of local teachers'." He suggested that a potentially productive relationship between LEA advisers and centre wardens was that the role of the adviser was in a particular content area of curriculum, while the warden's skill was process rather than content. In addition, the warden's role would be neutral, while the adviser had responsibilities to the chief education officer for the assessment of teachers and institutions.

Beresford saw the warden as a hybrid, acceptable to classroom teachers and LEA officers, as well as further education people. Such an individual should function outside the mainstream of the LEA staffing structure as a "status free change agent". He also suggested a consultancy role in helping teachers to make career and professional development decisions - "he may be involved with supporting long-term courses arranged by other institutions or advisers", and in his role as a catalyst, "he will be more directly involved with creating short-term opportunities for individuals and long-term support for schools".

Burrell (1976) observed that "it remains one of the peculiarities of British education that we assume someone who has been a skilled practitioner in the classroom or in some other role can transfer without training or with only a modicum of training into quite a different field. We assume this with heads of schools, with lecturers in colleges and departments of education, and with teachers' centre wardens. It is interesting that members of the newly-formed association

of wardens at both regional and national levels are setting up in-service programmes for themselves to improve their own skills."

One could continue to quote ad infinitum statements regarding the function of teachers' centres wardens. Opinions on what skills they should bring to the position are as varied as centres themselves. Should he or she be mainly an administrator, adviser, leader, consultant, co-ordinator, catalyst, facilitator, change agent, "dogsbody", curriculum specialist, generalist, communicator, resource person, psychologist, politician, organizer or social director? - or a combination of all? Little wonder that Thornbury (1974) warned "above all, he (the warden) should not be found weakly propping up the teachers' centre bar at midnight, waiting for his last colleague from the schools to depart".

Whatever his skills or personal characteristics may or should be, the consensus of the literature is that the warden is a vital element in the success or failure of the centre.

6. FUNCTION AND ACTIVITIES

The primary functions of teachers' centres would appear to be :

- a) curriculum development
- b) in-service training (and more recently induction training)
- c) social
- d) resources and services

DeVault (1974a) identified a further function as serving as "a convenient neutral venue for meetings, exhibitions and local survey or report writing groups". This, however, might well be viewed as an activity related to function.

The extent to which centres are involved in one or more of the above functions varies widely according to budget, facilities, equipment and, undoubtedly, local needs and the individual interests of wardens. Large general purpose centres might participate in all activities, while centres set up to deal with curriculum development in a specific subject area would naturally have more limited activities of a specialized nature. The fact that centres originated for a variety of purposes has affected their development.

Eighty-nine of the centres which responded to a 1972 NUT survey were the result of Nuffield or Schools Council math, science or modern language programs, as has been noted. Centres set up at a later date tend to be multi-purpose and are the most prevalent. McKeegan (1977) found that fifty-four of the fifty-six wardens replying to the questionnaire

administered at a national conference in 1974 classified their centres as "general purpose".

Kahn (1974) described the activities of Enfield, which probably exemplify those of a large general purpose centre. They included lectures, which Kahn termed as non-participatory and therefore less and less a part of the program; workshop courses, the mainstay; working parties to discuss particular topics in the curriculum or a new development in education; exhibitions of curriculum materials, students' work, books, equipment and even furniture; teachers' association meetings; and social programs which included a weekly "Open Night". In addition, the centre published a newsletter which was widely distributed and a program of activities for each term. (A sample program for the fall term of 1974 is included in Appendix I.)

Three user surveys undertaken by Bradley, Flood and Padfield (1975) of teachers' centres in the Nottingham area indicated the most popular type of meeting was where teachers could learn new techniques or content in various subject areas. Little interest was expressed in general meetings on broader issues of education. They concluded that "although there is a general increase in the number of teachers becoming interested in broader based curriculum development work, it appears that many teachers still feel the need for what might well be termed the 'bread and butter' type activities which can be related easily with the classroom situation and to which they can be directly transferred".

The centre functions are discussed in detail in the following pages.

a) Curriculum Development

"The essence of curricular review and development is new thinking by the teachers themselves, as well as their appraisal of the thinking of others." So stated the Schools Council in its 1967 Working Paper No. 10 which gave impetus to the rapid growth of teachers' centres. As a national independent body concerned with curriculum innovation, the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations naturally perceived the primary role of centres, which it encouraged Local Education Authorities to establish, as teacher involvement at the local level with school curricula.

The term "curriculum development" itself seems open to wide interpretation; one man's curriculum development might conceivably be another's "cut and paste". Mulhern (1976) noted that while provision of materials, software kits, reprographic services, etc. might be desirable, it was questionable to what extent their use constituted curriculum development. He suggested that the formation of teacher groups engaged in the systematic study of district curriculum and the development of local guides and programs was generally recognized as curriculum development.

The Schools Council, in assessing its own involvement with curriculum development, saw a process with four essential elements -

- 1) defining the objectives of teaching a particular course or the curriculum as a whole, based on informed judgment and drawing on all available sources of knowledge

- ii) the development and trial use in schools of methods and materials
- iii) the assessment of the extent to which the development work achieved its objectives
- iv) the feedback of the experience gained to provide a starting point for further study

The Council perceived this as a continuous process responding to intellectual, social and economic changes. It saw a standard national pattern as "neither desirable nor necessary". As for the participation of universities and colleges in local curriculum development, it felt involvement in the work of teachers' groups would be beneficial to both the staff and students of colleges of education, but "what universities and colleges can do in support will depend upon what the Local Education Authorities and the teachers say that they most need". This might take the form of training facilities for leaders of groups or centres, or undertaking studies to provide starting points for local work. Quite "loud and clear" the Council made it apparent that the controlling group in local curriculum development was to be the teachers themselves.

The Council, encouraged by the results of Nuffield projects and the CSE syllabus construction, hoped that teachers would meet more and more in groups to discuss curriculum problems, and that LEA's would "do all that is practicable to encourage such groups, and in particular help them with the use of accommodations, apparatus and secretarial

assistance as may be necessary".

More specifically, the Council saw the function of local centres as threefold - first, to give teachers a setting in which to discuss and define new objectives; secondly, to act as a spokesman to provide feedback on local evaluation of materials which the Council felt would "give nationally initiated work a solid foundation in widespread teacher experience and judgment"; and thirdly, as a means whereby teachers locally could be kept informed about research and development in progress elsewhere. This, it felt, was essential in order for teachers to participate in the work of curriculum review and to modify and appraise materials for individual and local needs.

Ten years down the road, how well have teachers' centres, now numbering somewhere in the neighbourhood of 600, responded to the "little red pamphlet's" plea for teacher involvement in local curriculum change and development? Any valid assessment based on results is impossible because, as noted in the section "Research and Evaluation", formal evaluation of the work of teachers' centres or their effect on classroom teaching or student achievement is almost nonexistent.

Rosen (1972) stated "it cannot be emphasized too strongly that evidence relating curriculum reform to teachers' centers operations is unavailable". Somewhat desperately, however, he continued that for purposes of his discussion "it is assumed that the curriculum reform strategy of the British

teacher centre model is valid under the circumstances and conditions in which it operates in the United Kingdom".

What little evidence exists tends to be the observations of American researchers. McKeegan (1977), reporting on a survey of fifty-eight wardens found that "under ideal conditions in-service education was seen as less important than curriculum development. Under the real condition in-service education was rated as more important."

While teacher-based curriculum was the preferred ideal, McKeegan concluded that with minimum staff and budget, presentation of national curriculum projects would be feasible whereas modification to meet local needs might require resources and time commitments beyond what was possible. "Only with major increases in staff or support ... does curriculum work with individual teachers begin to approach school-based curriculum as favoured emphasis among wardens."

More negative was Taylor (1974) who viewed British teachers' centres as ineffectual because of their smallness and limited facilities - "in consequence, they become venues for lectures, discussions, social gatherings and for very occasional pieces of curriculum development or resource production by energetic individuals or very small groups." He recommended stronger centres to support selective curriculum development staffed by full-time subject specialists and people with graphic and clerical skills.

On the other hand, Mulhern (1976) warned "ideologically, the centres need to develop a full range of advisory and consultancy services to be really forceful in curriculum

development and yet, to do so would probably place them in conflict with their teacher clientele and the district curriculum leadership". He suggested that the confusion in curriculum development exists because some early centres were initially established as part of a curriculum project in which they played a key role, whereas later ones were not part of a specific curriculum project. Mulhern further noted the lack of "positive leadership in curriculum development".

Certainly, British educators have had an ongoing concern about teachers' centres' participation in curriculum development. Thornbury (1974) noted that "the dichotomy between in-service training and curriculum development again reared its head" at three conferences held by the Schools Council in 1970. The release of teachers was a major issue - "everyone agreed that straightforward arrangements could be made to release teachers for in-service training courses. But it was essential that teachers volunteered for curriculum development". He referred to the "higher good" as always being curriculum development and saw teachers' centres as "a Venus fly-trap where the colour and scent of courses lured teachers on to the sticky surface of curriculum development".

The 1972 survey of the NUT found curriculum development was not handled in a sufficiently positive way and attributed this failure, in part, to inexperience in dealing with group situations and lack of training.

Richards (1972), as deputy headmaster at a primary school, argued that Working Paper No. 10 underestimated the complexities of local curriculum development. He complained of lack of terms of reference, inability of group leaders to see where they were going, and individual teachers as overpressed and uninterested. He pointed out that curriculum planning was not recognized as part of every teacher's professional responsibility and questioned the reality of the British teacher's much vaunted autonomy.

Owen (1972) felt that centres which were tightly bound to one national project had the best chance of survival.

Walton (1972) expressed concern that teachers had not assumed "the dynamic role" anticipated by the Schools Council, except for some involved with specific projects such as the North West Regional Curriculum Development Project. He blamed poor financial support which resulted in part-time wardens and limited resources.

Roseveare (1974), speaking from the warden's point of view, felt that, while some of her colleagues were eager to take a more positive lead in curriculum development, their terms of appointment precluded this. Local academic boards and LEA officers, she stated, have made it clear "it would not be acceptable for the wardens to assume any such inspectorial or advisory role. The fact remains that there is work that needs doing, and that it only occurs in uncoordinated ways, since it is no one's particular responsibility."

On the other hand, another warden, Greenwood (1974).

working from the base of ideas inherent in the North West Regional Curriculum Development Project, reported generally positive experience in the leadership role. However, he emphasized a practical difficulty which was unrecognized at the national level. Teachers involved in curriculum development, he stated, required support of all kinds, but "the greatest resource we can offer them is time".

Butten (1973) of the Barnstable and North Devon Teachers' Centre proposed an incorporation of curriculum development and in-service training based on American researcher Havelock's (1971) social and problem-solving interaction models for utilization of knowledge. He felt that centres to date "had not been guided by a coherent theory of innovation", and suggested that curriculum planning in the form of objectives start at the individual school level. The centre warden, by maintaining close contact with schools, could bring together working parties with similar aims. These groups would then be helped by outside consultants from project teams, universities, colleges, etc. to find solutions which would at the same time assist the diffusion of project and research findings. He felt that an expectation of rapid, large-scale change through teachers' centres was unrealistic.

Curriculum development at the national level has also been a subject for concern. Thornbury (1972) noted that the Schools Council was dominated by "teacher-politicians" whom he observed were paradoxically "not noted for their progressive

views on curriculum". He bemoaned the multiplicity of nearly one hundred uncoordinated projects emanating from "the tower of Babel at Great Portland Street".

By 1978, Gilchrist continued to decry the lack of success of national curriculum development projects, of which he stated "few of them can be said to have made more than a limited contribution to curriculum development in their particular areas". He suggested that some kind of "support" or "after-care" is necessary if innovation is to be widely implemented and commitment sustained, and suggested that teachers' centres have an important role to play in the local support system. He noted that since Thornbury wrote his book in 1973, "the curriculum component seems to have increased in teachers' centres with the gradual change in emphasis from instructional courses to local curriculum development groups". However, he also emphasized the wide variation in teachers' centres' facilities, equipment and the purposes for which they were established, (e.g., for specific curriculum projects), and concluded that "the local support which centres can give to national projects varies tremendously".

Gilchrist suggested that the James Committee's recommendation for professional centres, which were mainly seen as in-service training centres, could be expanded to act as an intermediate between the school and agencies of curriculum change. To what extent this tends to the direction of Richards' (1972) concerns that teachers' centres are in danger of becoming "mere outposts for the dissemination of Schools Council orthodoxy",

or Thornbury's fears that expansion of in-service education might be a powerful weapon for increasing centralized direction of curriculum, is an open question.

Such concerns might be balanced against Skilbeck's (1976) comments regarding his perception of an increase in "teacher freedom and autonomy". He stated "after ten years of highly productive activity, there is growing evidence that the Schools Council sees its future less in the generating of ready-made curriculum packages than in the support of local and regional initiatives, and in various other systems which will sustain teachers as at least participants in curriculum development".¹ This shift in responsibility he saw as a disillusionment with "descending models" (which he noted may be more relevant to the American than British experience). The claim is frequently made that the model has not worked "or, more precisely, that the massive investment in national projects dominated by scholars from the disciplines and by management strategies has paid inadequate dividends in the form of changed schooling".

More negative is Self (1977) who suggested that "the changes in educational climate, and the increasingly widespread feeling that enough of new ideas are enough (at least for a while) may remove the need for special centres for curriculum development". It could however be argued that even a return to basics would create a need for "development".

¹The Council stated in its 1974-75 report after ten years of operation "it has been no part of the Schools Council's role to determine the curriculum which any school should use; rather, the Council's aim has been to make available a wide range of materials and suggestions which schools might adopt or adapt as they felt to be desirable".

Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6 (1970) referred to the comments of a headmaster who had been chairman of a centre steering committee - "he complained of the tendency to equate curriculum development with change; surely far more of it was concerned with making the traditional more efficient and more relevant to pupils' needs and the society of the schools served?".

Mulhern's (1976) comments may also be pertinent to the current situation relating to curriculum development in teachers' centres:

"It seems incredulous, in many ways, that a structure designed to promote curriculum change could be so firmly established in such a short period of time. It is becoming increasingly obvious that traditional barriers to sweeping curriculum reform, i.e., the safeguarding of traditional institutional primacy in certain areas, reluctances on the part of teachers to undergo the personal and professional changes necessary to effect permanent change, the traditional opposition to planned change, etc. were not truly resolved in the establishment of centres but merely brushed aside by the momentum of the movement. The ability of centre leadership to deal with these problems will in the long run, determine the longevity of the centres."

b) In-Service Training

In-service training or education has, from the beginning, been an important feature of British teachers' centres. In fact, as has been noted, in spite of the ideological commitment to curriculum development, it has been suggested that in-service training may have been the primary activity (McKeegan 1977).

However, as Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6 (1970) pointed out the relationship between the two is often overlooked. In-service training is in fact the imparting of the results of successful curriculum development and the reinforcement of that success.

Certainly the James Committee focused attention on in-service education and the recommendations for the establishment of "professional centres" emphasized the role of training at the local level. Whether the current interest in in-service education is related primarily to professional need and concern for the quality of education, or to the present political/economic climate is probably impossible to identify. Devaney (1975), an American teachers' centre director, in commenting on U.S. experiments with centres, suggested a more deliberate motive. She contended that increasing American interest in in-service training is a result of a national disillusionment and a desperate search for remedy, or, one might almost be tempted to add, a scapegoat - "twenty years of national experimentation with school reform have produced no certifiable national panaceas, so the most recent variable that

"educational reformers have seized on to manipulate is in-service".

Thornbury (1974) blamed colleges of education for failing to adequately prepare young teachers for the classroom, and "the other traditional providers of in-service education, the university departments, had been too preoccupied since 1948 with making education a respectable academic subject, thereby failing to cater for the real needs of teachers". Professional associations, on the other hand, Thornbury contended were "concerned only with salary and conditions". It was left to the teachers' centres to "revitalize in-service training" (Kahn 1975).

Thornbury suggested that the earliest teachers' centres responded to the teachers' concern for the increasing diffuseness of their role and they sought "hard" teaching skills at the teachers' centres. "They became experts with overhead projectors, the phonics approach to reading, or the new mathematics". ROSLA and the introduction of comprehensive schools added to practicing teachers' needs for on-the-spot training responsive to local requirements.

The idea of teachers identifying their own local in-service needs and developing their own programs to respond to these needs on a voluntary basis runs throughout the literature. To what degree this approach has been successful once again can only be assessed in a limited way.

Definition of in-service training is almost as difficult as that of curriculum development. Kahn (1975) differentiates

between in-service training and in-service education. Training, he declared, implies a "solution-centred approach" whereby an instructor transmits a known solution to a large number of problems; this was largely the norm before teachers' centres through the medium of college lecturers, advisers, school inspectors, etc. Education on the other hand implies a "problem-centred approach" in which "teachers can call on the services and support of other agencies in coping with their professional needs".

Gough (1975) felt that in-service needs of teachers could be considered under four headings: personal intellectual needs, personal professional needs, the needs of schools, and the needs of the educational system. He commented that it was tempting to relate such needs to types of providers. For example, the first had traditionally been provided by universities with advanced diplomas or higher degrees; the needs of the school have been the province of the advisory service and the inspectorate, etc. He felt greater flexibility could be possible if all providers considered what their contribution might be to the four aspects; the emphasis might vary but there was little merit in allocation of firmly bound in-service "territories". Teachers' centres as providers should be seen as complementary to the contribution of other agencies, and unique in certain qualities such as their local nature, their neutral setting and the involvement of teachers themselves in decision-making.

Owen (1972), writing as a former joint secretary of the Schools Council and the Deputy Chief Education Officer for Devon, however, questioned the ability of teachers in England and Wales to organize their own training; he felt they were neither accustomed nor trained to manage their own re-education. "Too much autonomy for teachers led to wallowing about", Owen commented. He cited Devon's policy of allowing teachers' centres to find their own level and then supporting them with part-time and later an increasing number of full-time wardens and leaders. He found that initial requests from teachers tended to be for courses "simply to reduce their ignorance", e.g. courses in response to the British changeover to metrification, audio-visual aids, etc. Gradually teachers came to feel there were too many instructional courses; they were being "over-coursed" and a demand developed for semi-autonomous study groups. While they still asked for some instructional courses, they preferred to learn for themselves "under good guidance and good support".

Leadership is also emphasized by Burrell (1976) who commented:

"There is an obvious tendency for activities run by teachers for teachers, particularly if they are rather short in duration, to be merely recounting of successes or the subjective pooling of experience. These can provide a valuable starting point for significant activities, but it is extremely difficult to move many teachers beyond this starting point. It requires skilled leadership, time for reflecting and analysis, and above all, acceptance on the part of all concerned that the payoff is not immediate and in some cases not even identifiable."

Declining enrolment and reduction of the number of places required in the initial training of teachers has been perceived as a threat to teachers' centres. Self (1977) pointed out that centres have new rivals in the provision of in-service training. Colleges of education now find themselves under pressure to devote 20% of their resources to such an end. He urged centres to find a way of cooperating with the advisory service to develop a systematic program of training courses, and deplored the attitude of some wardens who resented visits of advisers to centres. He felt such an attitude would only prevent centres from being seen as effective rivals to the in-service courses colleges might offer - "where there is an integration of the advisory services (or even of the local inspectorate) with a network of teacher centres, then there is the framework for a relevant and democratic system of in-service training, based on actual teaching".

Immediately after the James committee report, Thornbury (1974) mentioned the "academic threat" and that university educationalists had begun to "eye greedily" the expansion of teacher education. Again, he commented that "covetous eyes have been cast by the colleges at the successful teachers' centres". As to the major teachers' union, the NUT, he commented that the leader "who has declared himself in favour of mandatory in-service courses, may inadvertently have put the teaching profession's head in a noose."

Kahn (1975), as a centre warden, praised the flexibility of centres which ensured that programs can be fitted to local in-service needs or even needs of particular school staff. "This type of flexible and co-operative planning emphasizes some of the flaws inherent in any plan to use spare plant in colleges for in-service education or for teachers' centres, as postulated at present by the DES."

By 1977, Kahn was urging centre leaders to accept other providers as potential allies rather than "subversive agents aiming to usurp the centre's work", but he noted that if such a professional network was to be relevant, it must inherit the centre's philosophy of the teacher professional and its mode of operation. Teachers' centres, having established neutrality and flexibility and having built up a network of contacts "with all that is best and most relevant among other providers, are in the ideal position to stand in the centre of such a professional network". In-service activities should be conducted by the most suitable unit in the network. "At the administrative centre will be the teachers' centre and its staff, still answerable to the committee structure with an in-built teacher majority."

Rosner (1972), as an American observer, described British teachers' centres as offering "highly pragmatic, locally determined, immediately relevant instruction in subject matter of the primary and secondary school curriculum, and in curriculum materials, resources and techniques".

McKeegan (1977) found the recommendation of the James

Committee regarding professional centres a positive approach to integration of theory and practice, particularly in their emphasis on career follow-up of beginning teachers. However, he recognized that it created problems: "whether attention can continue to be given to the individual teacher while simultaneously developing more programmatic approaches combining practice and theory may be the ongoing dilemma for such centres".

Obviously teachers' centres are in a defensive position to protect teacher autonomy. To what extent teachers' centres and academic institutions can cooperate or to what extent it may affect the future of teachers' centres remains to be seen.

c) Induction Training

Pre-service training of British teacher candidates appears to have been left mainly in the hands of colleges of education while induction training (that, is orientation of probationary first year teachers) had been neglected. Teachers' centres have undoubtedly, since their inception, played a role in providing a place where young teachers could find a friendly atmosphere in which to discuss, listen, experiment and learn.

The James Committee report recommended that new teachers be assigned to a specific professional centre and be released from teaching duties for not less than one day a week for induction activities. A "professional tutor" should be designated and trained for each school and would assist new teachers in working out a program of study with the professional centre.

The Government White Paper agreed emphatically that young teachers needed special help with somewhat less than coordinated results. Stevens and Cohen (1976) noted in the Times Educational Supplement that induction was becoming a part of the assumptions of teachers and trainers and there were signs that new teachers "were getting a better deal". However, "as to the appointment of professional tutors, at the rather sick end, a large number of people were now calling themselves professional tutors and writing around to find out what they should be doing".

Julius (1976a) of City University of New York viewed the

induction plan in a visit to Britain in somewhat more positive terms. She reported on the two officially designated pilot schemes at Liverpool and Northumberland, and several unofficial programs operating in conjunction with existing teachers' centres.

At the official areas, funding for released time for teacher-tutors and probationers was available, as well as salaries for replacements. Tutors were variously internal or external to the probationers' schools. Teachers' centre courses were used extensively and offered a wide variety of subject matter. Julius observed that "one important benefit of the trial induction programs is the therapeutic value of discussion groups made up of probationary teachers". However, she also noted that probationary teachers expressed less enthusiasm for courses at professional centres than for teacher-tutors, and were reluctant to leave their classrooms for one day a week since they felt it was unsettling for the children. They also expressed a bias against college of education lecturers, although national evaluators of the project at the University of Bristol insisted that the expertise provided resulted in upgrading the usual teachers' centre courses. Probationers preferred tutors who were peers and experienced colleagues.

Whether professional centres will be developed and, if so, to what degree they would be based on existing teachers' centres cannot be predicted, especially in light of present stringent economic conditions.

d) Social

"The one physical feature common to all centres, it has been said, is an apparatus for making tea", observed Skilbeck (1976).

While it would be easy to dismiss the social function of the British teachers' centre, it is obvious that this role has been a major factor in its development. The atmosphere of the "teachers' club" appears to be inherent in many centres, especially those located in separate facilities, and related to what Skilbeck terms "the club spirit". From the workingman's "local pub" to the upper class "gentlemen's club", there appears to be a British tradition of "belonging" or being attached to a social centre of one's peers.

Throughout the British literature, one is aware of this cohesiveness which is underplayed simply, one assumes, because it is so in keeping with the normal pattern of social life.

Use of centres, said the School Council in its Working Paper No. 10 (1967), will depend on the suitability and comfort of equipment and furnishings. "Regular evening and weekend use should develop quickly but day use from Monday to Friday will depend on the policies, particularly those of staffing, of individual authorities".

The NUT Survey (1972) demonstrated the wide variation in facilities, mentioning one large centre employing gardeners, cooks, five barmen and fifteen waitresses.

Gough (1974) noted that "there is no doubt that the

presence of a bar helps the more informal activity", and pointed out that this atmosphere has not infrequently contributed to discussion and the generation of new projects.

Kahn (1974), warden of Enfield Centre, mentioned the lounge and servery in which teas and light refreshments were served daily, and spoke of weekly open nights offering bridge, table tennis, television, chess, feature film shows, etc.

It is perhaps this aspect of teachers' centres which is most foreign to North Americans. Bender (1975), as an American observer, pointed out that "the establishment and growth of places for teachers of common interests and concerns to meet was socially acceptable in England and Wales, but for Americans this side of center activity seems to be neither needed nor desired. In fact the development of this part of center activity might drive many American educators away from the centers".

e) Resources and Services

American observer Bender (1975) viewed centres for teachers as falling into three categories - teachers' centres, technical and science centres, and area resource centres.

"Teachers' centres" he defined as run by teachers for teachers usually from an immediate geographic area, more often involving primary rather than secondary teachers, and tending to meet both the professional and social needs of teachers. "Technical and science centres" were identified as operated by "specialists from industry or persons from further (higher) education or research institutions in co-operation with teachers". "Resource centres" he perceived as "like teachers' centres, but with major emphasis on the professional and little concern for the social side of teachers' lives. They usually serve larger geographic and academic areas". He admitted, however, it was difficult to find an English or Welsh centre which totally fitted into one of these descriptions.

Another American educator, McKeegan (1977) classified British centres as general purpose, special purpose and resource centres.

Bender was obviously influenced by Schools Council Working Paper No. 43, School Resource Centres (1972) which distinguished between these centres, resource collections and resource libraries, a distinction Bender noted was not always

made in America. The centre encourages the production and utilization of a resource collection, while the term "libraries" is applied to an index of items available. Also cited was a report by Garnett (1972) which dealt with "area resource centres". These were viewed as clearing houses for materials produced by schools, as well as other educational agencies and publishers. They incorporated training facilities and workshops.

This concept would appear to be more in keeping with the American "teaching center". In fact, in another 1972 article by Hubbard and Salt, it was suggested that much could be learned from the American experience and they recommended the possibility of teachers' centres becoming "teaching resources centres". Communication among centres was also emphasized in order to avoid the danger of "an essentially parochial approach". Interestingly enough, in keeping with Bender's observations on the social function of teachers' centres, Hubbard and Salt emphasized "the importance of those evolving institutions as social centres".

It is also significant that all three references to resource centres were published in 1972 and may reflect the influence of the "transatlantic tennis match".

The validity of attempting to categorize centres, especially in the area of resources, is questionable. In general, teachers' centres provide some resources relating to the function they perform at the local level. Obviously,

the quantity, and to some extent the quality, are dependent on space, budget, and the expertise and knowledge of the selector. Whether some centres can be defined as "resource centres" rather than "teachers' centres" is probably dependent on the amount of emphasis given to display or loan of materials compared to their utilization for functions such as curriculum development and in-service training.

Such resources may take the form of books, kits, realia, films, slides and other audio-visual software. On the service side, centres may provide A/V hardware and reprographic equipment to be used in conjunction with materials and workshop activities.

What appears to distinguish the true "teachers' centre" is the employment of such materials and equipment in keeping with the original philosophy and rationale of the concept - that is, with the emphasis on "teachers'" rather than "teaching". Once again, it is apparent that semantics are as much a problem with the term "resource centre" as with "curriculum development", "in-service training", "in-service education", and "teaching center", "teacher center" or "teachers' centre". In all areas, there would seem to be passive and active roles involving, on the one hand, communication and training, and on the other participation, original thinking and adaptation to local needs.

Kahn (1974) argued against a separate "resource centre" for an area. He felt that resources should be an integral part of the main centre because :

- i) resources attract teachers who might not otherwise visit the centre
- ii) resources can lead to involvement with other centre activity
- iii) courses and resources are inseparable, and this relationship will increase in "this age of technology"
- iv) a building housing only "machinery" is cut off from its life blood - discussion and examination for use in the classroom situation

Kahn mentioned the concentration of resources at Enfield consisting of a library, materials, reprographic equipment and audio-visual aids.

It is interesting, however, that the three national conferences on teachers' centres held in 1969 (Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6, 1970) raised the question of the amount of equipment and resources that centres should hold. Questions arose as to whether the concept of a resource centre furthered the work or distorted the essential nature of the centre "making it a high-powered institution with a less direct relationship with the classroom". Such emphasis could also lead a warden away from his main task. It suggested the criterion for deciding what resources a centre should own might well depend on (apart from money) whether they were readily available elsewhere and concluded - "indeed, in terms of resources the logical and sensible development could be for teachers' centres to further develop their function as

"organizing centres, the place where local teachers could find out what was available and how it could be obtained".

More currently, there has been a fear that with the increased involvement of colleges of education in in-service education, teachers' centres may in fact become resource centres to the exclusion of all other functions.

"With their original role likely to disappear (curriculum development), and a strong rival poised to usurp their second main function (in-service training), there is every likelihood of their becoming, at best, resource libraries and duplicating agencies." (Self 1977)

7. USERS

An overall observation might well be made with regard to centre use. It is apparent from the literature that a large number of centres are used primarily by elementary school teachers. This has been referred to in passing by a number of writers, although nowhere is it discussed in detail.

Walton (1972) commented "a further initial limitation has been placed on many centres, particularly in rural areas, because of the tendency for them to be associated with primary rather than secondary education. Often the centre warden has been a primary head or assistant teacher."

Thornbury (1974) referred to "the lack of involvement of secondary teachers in teachers' centres activities which is universally reported". Expressing his fears of centralism, he added that "secondary teachers disappear each afternoon into a vortex of after-school bureaucracy. It is difficult to persuade them, like the crew of the Titanic, that they may not be inviolably self-sufficient, that there is a world outside which includes colleagues who work just down the road - or that the iceberg of centralism may be drifting toward them."

Self (1977) observed that centres tended to be patronized mainly by primary school teachers for various reasons -

- a) infant and junior school teachers are more isolated and lack the support of colleagues with similar subject interests which is available to secondary teachers within their departments

- b) many wardens are former primary school teachers since it is one of the few ways to reach a higher level on the scale; secondary teachers can gain similar promotion without leaving schools
- c) secondary teachers may ignore the centre because it lacks facilities that compare with those in individual schools, e.g. laboratory equipment
- d) few primary schools can offer duplicating services to rival those at centres

In addition, certain developments which, in the past had involved groups of secondary teachers, were of a type which did not require the "workshop" setting offered by centres. For example, as pointed out in Schools Council Working Paper No. 10 (1967), creation of the C.S.E. syllabus had been largely confined to organizational arrangements. Teachers had generally come together in one another's schools. The same was undoubtedly true in the discussions and curricula revisions which took place as a result of raising the school leaving age. It would appear that most centres which had been set up as a result of ROSLA were established within individual secondary schools, or at times in redundant school buildings (Thornbury 1974).

On the other hand, Kahn (1977) stated that "centres have made it one of their tasks to break down barriers between secondary and primary colleagues".

Schools Council Working Paper No. 10 recommended centres serve not less than 400 teachers and not more than 800. McKeegan

(1977) reported in his survey of wardens in 1974 that centres served a median of 1325 teachers. Kahn in 1972 said that his urban centre at Enfield served 1500 teachers from 87 primary schools, 6 special schools and 19 comprehensive schools.

Various centres have undertaken user surveys. Bradley, Flood and Padfield (1975) reported on three investigations in the Nottingham area. One survey identified three distinct and typical groups most attracted to a centre. These were:

- a) young teachers of both sexes with one to five years experience, working with students in all age groups
- b) deputy heads and heads, mainly in primary schools
- c) women with 21 years' experience or more in primary schools

8. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS

Schools Council Working Paper No. 10 (1967) stated that:

"No local centre can expect to be self-sufficient over the whole field of curriculum development. It will need to draw support from many different sources, but particularly from the local education authorities and the universities. And this support will need to be supplied in a coordinated way, often across administrative boundaries. Arrangements for such coordination are of course a matter for local discussion and decision. Some large local education authorities will no doubt be able to supply all that is needed, making use of long-established traditions of cooperation with the universities and colleges of education. Others, and particularly the smaller local authority areas, are already sharing or planning to share, their resources with their neighbours and with the colleges and universities in their part of the country. And in some cases, a university is being invited to play the role of co-ordinator. But whatever arrangement best suit local circumstances and traditions, the need for some measure of co-ordination is clear and urgent; what is important is that the arrangement made should be acceptable to all the main partners in the operation."

Although some centres have been located in colleges of education or schools, in general there appears to have been a "hands-off" attitude towards teachers' centres by other organizations and institutions.

Certainly, the Council itself made it clear that local curriculum development was its objective. It emphasized that although the Council had been involved with "a limited number of development projects on a national scale", these should be viewed as "no more than one amongst a number of forms of support for local effort, and it should be remembered that national development projects, such as the Nuffield work in science have not been based upon ideas thought out by people remote from the schools, but upon ideas which have been almost entirely drawn from teachers themselves".

The Schools Council has variously been viewed as ineffectual, threatening, overly orthodox, too political, too detached, but rarely has it been accused of direct interference.

Working Paper No. 10 had emphasized that universities and colleges would support the work of local teacher groups based on their (the groups') expressed needs. These institutions might supply knowledge relevant to particular problems or offer training, especially for group or centre leaders, or undertake studies to provide a starting point for local work.

Walton (1972) commented that perhaps the spirit of Working Paper No. 10 was indeed interpreted as noninterference. "Local authorities after initiating their local centres, may not have been anxious to become too involved with a teacher run organization. Universities and colleges may have had similar but stronger sensitivities because anyway the centres, in the universities' eyes, were ultimately the responsibility of the local education authority." This attitude left the initiative to teachers' centres to approach other agencies, but centres may have been reluctant to invite outsiders for sustained activities because of the expense involved. Because of this, Walton felt centres had been: less active in curriculum development than originally planned and more concerned with low-level courses of a "bread and butter calibre".

As was discussed in the section "In-Service Training", the pressure for colleges of education to become more

actively involved in this area has the earmarks of a power struggle. This could result in closer cooperation between the two groups, or, alternatively, it could bring about the decline of teachers' centres to the extent that they would play a much less active role than they have in the past.

Much of the current discussion on the future of centres deals with the "network" concept, doubtless as a result of the James Committee recommendations for a "network of professional centres", and because of the term's current fashionability.

Kahn (1977), as has been noted in the section on in-service training, foresaw the time when teachers' centres might act as a kind of administrative centre of a local network of institutions and agencies providing in-service training. This, he continued with some vagueness "will extend through the regional level to the national level". This concept appears to relate to earlier discussions in the three national conferences held in 1970 which foresaw the need for a national information network.

Self (1977) urged that centres should find a way of co-operating with the advisory services to develop a systematic program of training courses. He commented "where there is an integration of advisory services (or even of local inspectorate) with a network of local teachers' centres, then there is the framework for a relevant and democratic system of in-service training, based on actual teaching". He felt that in order to survive teachers' centres should be prepared to accept

"a more mundane and less innovatory role as educational service stations" by providing such things as "cheap resources to teach the basic mathematical processes".

Gilchrist (1978) viewed teachers' centres as part of a local support system for nationally developed curriculum projects. He divided this system into three categories - authoritative, informative and supportive and saw teachers' centres in the latter role.

Burrell (1976) recognized the theoretical argument for a network of institutions and activities serving teachers but pointed out that there were a number of practical problems, particularly with the British background of hierarchical assumptions. Discussing such coordination at the regional level, he felt there was too much emphasis on structure rather than purpose - "not enough attention is being given to the pressing need to provide for flexibility and equality of status between all agencies in the field of in-service education".

American educator, Ruchkin (1974), in discussing the current American networking trend which involves funding of local agencies to meet local needs, commented "those wishing to delegate centralized authority to state and local needs fail to recognize that this approach can confirm the already existing practices and power structures, rather than stimulate a reordering of priorities and privileges".

As for the teachers' associations, Thornbury (1974) commented that their attitudes have fluctuated wildly from enthusiastic to hostile. Greenwood (1974) reported that

Burnley Centre, which was set up to facilitate the North West Regional Curriculum Development Project, was "blackened" by the union because it felt there was a lack of teacher involvement in the steering committee. However, as with other organizations, teachers unions appear, in general, not to have had a strong interest in teachers' centres, although one might assume it would be an issue for negotiation. Thornbury indicated that "union die-hards" within professional associations were mainly concerned with salary and conditions and had not asserted control over management committees of teachers' centres. He suggested that the 35% response to the 1972 National Union of Teachers' survey of teachers' centres "no doubt reflected the disenchantment felt by many wardens at the lack of interest shown in their work by the professional associations".

Relationship with other professionals in the community has been encouraged by some centres. Kahn (1977) reported that a meeting at Enfield Teachers' Centre on "pastoral care" had resulted in the formation of an Association of Pastoral Teachers, mainly of interest to secondary teachers, which brought together teachers, welfare officers, psychologists, police and other social agencies.

The question of parental involvement does not seem to have been a major issue to date. However, as early as 1972, Hubbard and Salt commented that "what we feel most strongly is that centres should provide a valuable neutral ground on which parents and teachers could come together".

Thornbury (1974) felt that the move towards "community schools" must be reflected in other aspects of local educational organization. He saw the possibility of teachers' centre participation, not only as a bulwark against centralizing trends, but as a "buffer state", explaining local schools' policy and feeding back the responses to the community, "before that uninformed controversy so destructive of trust has an opportunity to get off the ground". However, he felt there was a ring of nostalgia in the idea that neutral teachers' centres should become local "education advice shops", which reverted to an earlier concept proposed by the McNair Report of 1944.

Burrell (1976) saw such involvement as a gradual but necessary evolution: "it seems to me that the time is approaching when the centres should be seen as an arena for the exchange of ideas and expertise between parents and all engaged in or interested in education and related problems. We may need to move slowly but that should certainly be the direction".

The idea, however, may not be a popular one with British teachers if Bradley, Flood and Padfield's (1975) surveys of Nottingham teachers are at all representative. The majority (64.2%) felt teachers' centres should "cater mainly for teachers, but provide opportunities for pupil participation". Although 33.3% of teachers were in favour of the centres being open to all members of the community who wished

to listen, discuss or be actively involved in educational affairs, those who were against the suggestions were quite positively against, while many who agreed in theory were not sure it could be put into practice.

PART II - THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

1. RATIONALE

It is not the intent of this report to discuss American "teacher centers" extensively. Like their British cousins, they vary widely in size, location, facilities, amount of financial support, programs and activities. Unlike the British centres, however, they appear to reflect wide variations in philosophy and rationale.

Feiman (1977) commented "a critical reading of the literature on teacher centers discloses striking differences in the rhetoric used by center advocates, differences which suggest that behind various types of centers lie rather incompatible assumptions".

Yet American educators, especially after the publication of Stephen Bailey's article in 1971, responded wholeheartedly to the concept that fundamental educational reform would only come about through those charged with the basic educational responsibility - that is, the classroom teachers; that they would not accept the dictates of imperious, theoretical reformers; and that teachers would only take reform seriously if they were responsible for defining their own educational problems, delineating their own needs and receiving help "on their own terms and turf".

There is something about the wording of Bailey's rationale which is disquieting. Perhaps it is the feeling that with very slight rewording (substituting "parents" for "theoretical reformers"), Bailey's points could be converted to a

solution for handling recalcitrant adolescents and a rationale for setting up teen-age drop-in centres. The British share the American belief in the classroom teacher's ability to bring about change, but there is a subtle difference in attitude in Kahn's (1975) statement that teachers are professionals "involved both in deciding what is needed and in providing for it", or the comment in Schools Council Working Paper No. 10 (1967) that "the essence of curricular review and development is new thinking by the teachers themselves as well as their approval of the thinking of others".

American educators have been among the most frequent visitors to British centres. They have reported their findings in journal articles and reports that range from the naively idealistic "how I spent my summer vacation" variety to impressively documented analyses. Americans have been both the most avid publicists of their own teacher/teaching centres and their own most severe critics.

What happened in translating British "centres" into American "centers"? How can agreement on philosophy be so complete and implementation so different? Most importantly, what implications does the American experience have for Canadian education? Certainly the question cannot be wholly answered from the literature, which is the basis for this report, but at least questions can be raised which warrant serious and thoughtful consideration. There is much to be gained from studying the successes or failures of others.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It would, of course, be unrealistic to imply that either in Britain or the United States teachers' centres sprang forth Minerva-like and fully formed. Undoubtedly, the idea of providing a place for teachers to come together, to exchange ideas and to further their "professional development", has existed for a number of years in both countries.

Yager (1974) identified U.S. historical antecedents in post World War II "laboratory schools"; in various reports of the 1960's and 1970's which attacked teacher training and education; and in state and federal legislation in the same period which resulted in concepts such as the consortia in Florida.

Stabler (1975) identified the origins of U.S. centres as a response to three major thrusts:

- a) the problems and anxieties felt by teachers
- b) the search by universities, colleges, school systems and state departments of education for ways to improve teacher education
- c) the enthusiastic support of the U.S. Office of Education to carry out a "Plan for Education Renewal"

The "bandwagon" syndrome is certainly not uncommon in education, but the rapidity of the growth of U.S. centres was astonishing. Pilcher (1973) noted that within six to eight months of the appearance of Bailey's article, some

75 to 100 teachers' centres were reportedly in operation in the United States. He observed that prestigious institutions such as Harvard and the University of Massachusetts Schools of Education rushed to form groups to implement centres. A planning grant for 20 "renewal sites", each serving a cluster of schools and incorporating a teacher centre (a cutback from the initial ambitious proposal for 200 sites) suddenly materialized from the U.S. Office of Education. Three state departments of education received federal funding of \$250,000 each to set up centres, and Houston, Texas received roughly a million dollars from the U.S.O.E. for a program for teacher training, including teacher centres.¹

U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, visualized centres based on the British model where teachers and other educational personnel "will be able to come together to discuss problems in an atmosphere free of competition or compulsion, receive assistance and advice, improve their competencies, and exchange experiences". They were to provide for continuing career development and teachers were to be involved in "requesting the center, in planning for it, in operating it, in evaluating, and in redirecting the operation, but this does not mean, of course, that teachers would exclude administration, university personnel, the community, students, and others as appropriate to achievement of particular goals".

(Hyer et al, n.d.)

¹Pilcher's implication of the influence of Bailey's article on the U.S.O.E.* may be somewhat overstated. It is quite likely the Office of Education may have generated Bailey's article since he referred to Don Davies, acting deputy commissioner for development, as actively promoting the idea of a major network of teachers' centres.

*United States Office of Education

Almost overnight, U.S. education discovered that "the missing link that creates effective change in the classroom is the teacher". (Bell and Peightel 1976).

The development of U.S. centres would appear to have been largely based on concern for improved teacher education. As has been noted, many teachers' centres in Britain had their origins in curriculum-based projects; in-service training played an important role, but it was not a major issue until the James Committee and subsequent legislation placed teachers' centres in a semi-competitive position with colleges of education and university departments.

Stabler (1975) mentioned the American phenomena and cited the influential book Teachers for the Real World, edited by Othaniel Smith, published in 1969. Smith advocated a "training complex" which would be easily accessible to both schools and universities. As a cooperative enterprise of public schools, universities and colleges, and community agencies, the commitment to the education and training of teachers was to be explicit and firm. A Syracuse University study of teachers' centres in 1973-74 (Yager, et al, 1974) found that such free partnership and consortiums had developed between school districts and universities (i.e., "free" in the sense that it was entered into willingly, and not prescribed by state legislation or department of education).

At the state level, Stabler observed a relationship between centres and the development of competency-based teacher education. Some states, such as Florida, passed legislation

(Teacher Education Center Act, 1973) which established the framework for a system of centres housed in host schools as an integral part of a new state policy for teacher education. Van Fleet (1977) noted that these were not informal centres for the exchange of ideas and materials such as the British centres, nor were they specific sites where training took place, but "rather, they are coordinating agencies designed to plan, deliver and evaluate teacher training programs for thousands of Florida's teachers".

Other states such as California, Texas and Vermont passed legislation of a similar nature. Emmett D. Smith (1974) outlined state legislation which made reference to some form of "teacher centering".

At the other end of the spectrum, small local centres sprang up which generally, according to Stabler, had "an unstructured, free and flexible atmosphere". However, Stabler also observed that while the climate might be free and informal. "some of the centres are quite openly and visibly committed to a particular philosophy or movement".

3. THE AMERICAN ENVIRONMENT

As has been pointed out, the philosophical foundations for American centres are much less clearcut than the British, although the basic commitment and idealism appear similar.

Peiman (1977) said that "centers operate in a web of social, political and professional influences which complicate assessment". It would seem to be the differences in the British and American webs which account for the dissimilarity in implementation.

Bender (1975) commented that "educators in the U.S.A. have been quick to adopt words such as teacher center, center for teachers, resource center, et cetera; but they have not been so quick to adopt the ideas of a teachers' center. The words are popular, but the basic ideas of teachers' centers are either not understood by American educators or they are not appreciated by them". Pilcher (1973) reinforced this point of view "just because we speak the same language, Americans seem prone to the misconception that British institutions will work here".

The Syracuse Teacher Center Project (Yarger, et al. 1974) revealed more than 200 different titles for the 600 sites studied. Most common were "teacher center, teaching center, learning center, teacher education center, staff development center, educational cooperative, and training complex". Also included was a rich array of acronyms such as Project FAST (Federally Assisted Staff Training), UNITE (United Neighbourhoods in Teacher Education) and MEIL (Movement to Encourage

Improved Learning).

Schneider and Yarger (1974), commenting on the confusion, proposed a definition for their own chosen title of "teaching center", which stated:

"A place, in situ of changing locations, which develops programs for the training and improvement of educational personnel (in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, administrators, para-professionals, college teachers, etc.) in which the participating personnel have an opportunity to share successes, to utilize a wide range of education resources and to receive training specifically related to their most pressing teaching problems."

Bender (1975), in reviewing the American literature, commented that Schneider and Yarger "completely ignore the central position of teachers in English and Welsh education" and that, in general:

"The American 'experts' are doing something for the teachers. Article after article describing center after center tells how some third group is improving the lot of the American teacher. In the American centers, the teacher is there to use the materials, because the center people, or those funding and controlling the center, know better than the teachers what is best for the student. Even the large English centers recognize that the teacher knows better than the center what is best for the class and the student. There is

a mutual respect present in the English situation which is lacking in the British system."

Referring to this paternalistic attitude, Bender asked cynically "do we (Americans) like to have our children out of the house playing with teachers, whom we treat as large size children?" This attitude appears so ingrained that it surfaces even among those committed to the concept of independent teachers' centres. For example, an article by University of Chicago researcher Feiman (1975) reported on the evaluation of activity in an American center in Chicago where "the five of us who staff the Center are committed to 'open education'. We are vitally interested in seeing the expansion of viable choices for children and teachers within any class" She speaks of encouraging teachers to make their own materials, of the informal, supportive learning environment in which "teachers make noises, pursue interests, explore new ideas, techniques and materials according to their own individual styles, priorities and needs". After noting physical and verbal behaviour of teachers and that the primary activity was making materials working alone, Feiman commented that there was a temptation to subtitle the paper "Kindergarten Revisited" although "no pejorative connotations are intended". Nevertheless, one finds it difficult to picture a British researcher, pad and pencil in hand, classifying teachers' conversations over a cup of tea or a pint of Guinness, or evaluating whether teachers were "manipulating materials" or indulging in "Construction 1" or "Construction 2".

Pilcher (1973) spoke of the contrast in attitude in England and mentioned that "there are reports of university professors going to teachers for advice and visiting classrooms to learn from practioners".

Pilcher also bitterly identified the American public school teacher as the "nigger" of the system. Teachers, he contended, scrape, bow and listen politely to university and outside experts, then revert to their old ways - or, if necessary "continue to follow the form of the expert's prescription without its underlying rationale".

In the long run, in Pilcher's opinion, it is the power relationship which prevents the implementation of the British philosophy within the American system. The United States, he argues, has no history of professional autonomy for teachers. From the days of the frontier school house, Americans have operated on the assumption that since they created the schools and hired the teachers, they have the right to determine what goes on in the classroom. "Schools have become highly susceptible to the pressure tactics of organized special interest", and the school system which must fight a political battle for public money, takes the necessary steps to ensure its own survival. This leads to a supervisory and evaluation bureaucracy to ensure that the rank and file (the teachers) do nothing to jeopardize the system's political advantage. Pilcher adds:

"To the extent that teacher centers make a statement about who control what goes on in schools, the issues

are political. To the extent that establishing teacher centers involves a redistribution of that power the issues become those of political change and of strategies for achieving that change."

English educator, Charity James (1974), who has frequently lived and worked in the United States, expressed a similar point of view. She commented that the American school was derived from the early need of individual communities to educate their young - "so the teacher starts off as a servant of the community". The relative independence of British teachers, she attributed to the fact that schools derive from the priestly tradition and later in the early nineteenth century "from a middle class movement to improve (and control) the masses. So every classroom teacher inherits some sense of self-determination and professional authority".

Because of the American tradition, direct citizen involvement at the local level in educational issues would appear to be a much stronger movement in America than in Britain. Public demands for accountability, for tighter financial controls, for lower taxes, for participation in decisions affecting "the quality of life" at all levels of government appear to be increasing. Coupled with this, is a seeming disillusionment with the new and innovative, a resistance to more change, and a certain idealistic nostalgia for a return to the "simplicity" of the past, including the current "back to the basics" movement in education.

Collins (1974) described the Durham Teacher-Parent

Center in Philadelphia which provides programs and workshops for teachers, parents, resource people and other adults involved with educational growth. Davis (1975) outlined centres set up by the Minneapolis Public School System (jointly funded after a year's operation by the University of Minnesota) to meet "training needs of faculty and parents". The governing board of one teachers' centre, for example, had eight parents from the community, an equal number of teachers and one principal. Teachers or citizens in the community who have a particular project or "need to know" make application to the centre which must be approved by the board. Provision of space or training facilities may be at the centre or other locales or institutions depending on the project.

As in the case of British centres, few articles have been written from the point of view of individual teachers or professional associations. Crosby (1974), a Maryland social studies teacher, probably reflected many of his colleagues' views when he complained that teachers and schools were being asked to do too much; pre-service education was generally irrelevant to real needs of teachers; and in-service programs were random and underfinanced. He saw centres mainly as offering professional development programs reflecting the needs of local teachers and students. He made the point that "although they are the target of almost everything we are about in the educational system, kids almost never enter any discussions of educational reform".

Crosby also discussed two professional association views expressed in a 1974 report, entitled Inside Out, of the National Teachers' Field Task Force, and in Teacher Centers: Who's In Charge?, prepared by David Selden of the American Federation of Teachers and Dave Darland of the National Education Association (incorporated as part of the Task Force Report). Both concerned themselves with in-service education.

The first urged placing program control in the hands of teachers and obtaining funds from public sources. Selden and Darland emphasized the need to exclude principals and other administrators from teacher centres. They suggested a centre could not be financed for under \$250,000 a year which would require federal and state support, as well as local funds. They also discussed the possibility of "a decentralized bureaucratic model" through an agency of a local education authority, "presumably subsidized by the USOE". However, in spite of certain benefits such as continuity and response to local needs, they expressed concern that, even with a teacher advisory committee, "the force inherent in an official board of education agency would erect a barrier which even the most benign director would have difficulty overcoming". They continued that an official board of education agency would take the responsibility for technical improvement out of the hands of teachers. "Once again teachers would be responding to administrators rather than engaging in the problem-solving process through their own initiative and energy."

Finally, they suggested an autonomous, self-government model set up as a non-profit corporation. Teacher representatives would be selected by teachers' organizations or unions.

Selden, in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in 1974, suggested that local bargaining units should include establishment of teachers' centres under supervision of a board of trustees chosen jointly by the union and the school superintendents, and financed by the board of education in an amount equal to at least 2% of the annual operating budget.

It is interesting to note that even in the presentations of professional associations, no emphasis is placed on curriculum development.

Other factors have been mentioned within the American structure which influence acceptance of the British philosophy - preoccupation with "big is better", the strong influence of behaviourists in American education, the growing emphasis on competency and performance-based legislation reflecting increased public concern with educational results.

Vincent Rogers (1976) summarized those American attitudes, beliefs and practices which seemed to contrast sharply with British views and procedures. Assuming Roger's analysis is valid, it would be interesting to consider how the comments relate to the Ontario environment and the implications for the possible development of teachers' centres. Briefly, Rogers' points were:

- a) despite talk of local initiative and decentralization educational decisions tend to be systemwide (or sometimes statewide). The principle of localism is not widely supported in the U.S. Curricular and methodological change are largely a local responsibility in Britain.
- b) American teachers and administrators are far more vulnerable to outside non-professional pressures than their British counterparts. These may come from political groups, churches, or other special interest groups, as well as the massive American education industry.
- c) views of the role of teachers and principals differ widely in the two societies. Teachers are not encouraged in the U.S. to act as decision makers or agents for curricular change and adaptation on a local level. Principals do not generally have the power to behave autonomously as do British heads; they tend to see themselves as school managers, rather than as educational leaders. In Britain, change in curriculum and methodology are, as has been noted, a local responsibility and almost exclusively the province of the professional and educational community.
- d) over the years, a vast education bureaucracy has been built up in the U.S., including all types of directors, co-ordinators, specialists, etc. The effect has been to cripple truly local initiative and to encourage the development of a subject-centred, atomized approach to education and the creation of a largely authoritative

approach to the running of schools.

- e) teacher education in America tends to reflect many of the above problems - that is, it is authoritative in nature, bureaucratic, rather narrow in its educational view and unresponsive to the wishes of many of its constituents.

4. TYPES OF CENTRES - ACTIVITIES, GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

Because of the wide variation in facilities which come under the umbrella of American "teacher/teaching centers", no attempt is made to generalize on activities. The literature is extensive and many case studies are available.

For example, Van Fleet (1967 and 1977) described state-legislated centres in Florida; Quinn (1976) covered a consortium in New York state where all teacher education programs must be competency-based by 1980; Buxton (1976) described a privately funded centre in Oakland, California based on a British model; Levin and Horwitz (1976) discussed the Teacher Center Inc., an independent centre in New Haven, Connecticut; Feiman (1975) evaluated teacher participation in a centre in Chicago; Ruchkin (1974) outlined the operation of a centre jointly staffed by a metropolitan school system and an elementary teacher preparation program of a major urban university; Collins (1974) described centres in Dallas, Appalachia, Philadelphia, West Virginia, Rhode Island, San Francisco and Camillus, N.Y. -- and so on.

As Schmieder and Yarger (1974) commented, the term teacher center "might just as well refer to three teachers opening a store front in Harlem as to a state-controlled network designed to serve literally thousands of teachers and other educational personnel". They identified seven organizational types of centres - independent, "almost" independent, professional organization, single unit, free partnership, free consortium, legislative/political consortium.

Bender (1975) noted three variations - material resource centres, special education/handicapped centres; and workshops (none of which, he commented, is a "teachers' center"). Van Fleet (1972) simply referred to centres as single-agency or multi-agency, while DeVault (1974a) elaborated on twelve types of U.S. centres:

- a) independent ("tea" centres modelled after British)
- b) staff development (establishment centres)
- c) consortium (cooperating centres)
- d) exemplary material and experience (full banquet centres)
- e) installation ("hottest thing in new centres" - delivery systems)
- f) creativity ("do your own thing" centres)
- g) regional training ("training smarts" centres)
- h) field intern (university in a strange land centres)
- i) lighthouse (swing place centres)
- j) concept (process is more important than place centre)
- k) combination (mongrel centre - most common)
- l) other (ideal centre - most commonly found in the minds of creative people)

Feiman (1977) based her classification on philosophic foundations:

a) Behavioural

- skills training
- delivery system for education innovation
- coordinating mechanism for federal and state programs
- emphasis on technology and getting teachers to adopt techniques and materials selected and developed by experts

b) Humanistic

- similar to British

- increases teachers' sense of control over their own professional development
- makes assumption practicing teachers "untapped reservoir", and teacher development will occur naturally in neutral environment
- responsive instead of prescriptive

c) Developmental

- stretches teachers beyond their own starting point
- has a concept of kinds of conceptual and behavioural changes
- teachers begin at their own beginnings, draw on their own strength, learn at their own pace, but centre offers systematic, long-term intervention

One could continue to draw on the literature for categorization, but it would only serve to reinforce the diverse nature of American centres.

The brief outline of historical background indicated some major sources of funding, but Collins (1974) identified eight variations:

- a) shoestring
- b) state department of education, participating schools and colleges
- c) universities and teachers' colleges
- d) school systems
- e) university and state department of education
- f) university, state and federal
- g) U.S. Office of Education
- h) national or private foundations

As to governance, Collins perceived five methods

- a) school systems
- b) university dominated
- c) teachers/parents
- d) university and school systems
- e) store-front

It is interesting to note that no mention is made of a centre predominantly governed by teachers. Obviously, in the case of finance and governance, as in types of centres, one could continue with endless combinations of "mix and match".

PART III - BRITISH AND AMERICAN CENTRES - CURRENT ISSUES

1. EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

Little research or evaluation appears to have been undertaken in either Britain or the United States on the effectiveness of teachers' centres in relation to their two major functions of curriculum development and in-service training. Consequently, the influence of centres on teachers' classroom effectiveness is an unknown factor, as is the extent to which they have helped to initiate educational change or reform.

"There are however no hard data on evaluation, nor are the British interested in formal evaluation", commented American researcher McKeegan in a paper on teachers' centres presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting in April of 1977. American observers appear to be continually bewildered, and one senses, somewhat dismayed, by this British lack of interest in research - or even in behavioural approaches. Julius (1976a) on a visit to England to investigate the pilot induction plans which incorporated use of centres, commented on the latter: "there was no attempt to introduce any scientific interaction analysis. Compared with the U.S.A., Britain has made few attempts to use this type of training and educators seem skeptical about its efficacy".

British researchers and academics may simply not be interested in teachers' centres. On the other hand, there may also be an awareness that there are dimensions which

cannot be measured through hard data, and which are so long-term that their effect cannot readily be identified. And finally, the lack of academic research may be part of the "hands off" attitude referred to previously.

Thornbury (1974) mentioned several British theses covering aspects of in-service training, teacher attitudes and the role of the warden, most of which related to a specific centre, but no major research was noted.

The Times Educational Supplement of September 26, 1975 reviewed a study by Dr. Elizabeth Goodacre of the Reading University Centre for the Teaching of Reading. She found, through a questionnaire, that half of all LEA's had centres, but the quality of many was questionable. Referring specifically to information and courses relating to reading, Dr. Goodman judged that only one centre in five had the reading materials and books teachers needed. Lack of space, lack of money, or lack of wardens' time or experience were given as reasons.

Most British and American research on British centres has been confined to questionnaires at the national level or local user surveys, a number of which have been cited in Part I of this report (e.g., McKeegan (1977); Bradley, Flood and Padfield (1975); and the various Schools Council and NUT surveys). Results tend to be supportive of the frequently quoted aphorism, "British teachers vote with their feet".

Attendance has therefore largely been used as a proof of success, although Julius pointed out that such figures

can be misleading. For example, out of a total of 24,000 London teachers, there were 20,000 attendances at teachers' centres in 1974. However, no record of individual registration was available and the numbers may reflect duplicate groups of committed teachers.

British researcher Burrell (1976), recognizing the fallibility of such data, urged that centres and other agencies supplying in-service education needed to develop clear procedures for the evaluation of their activities, other than "simplistic ideas of head-counting, reports and follow-up surveys". He was, however, unable to suggest any way in which this could be done.

In spite of American criticism and the voluminous output of reports, the situation in the U.S. would appear to be little better. McKeegan noted that "despite the extent of interest in teachers' centres in the United States, there is precious little empirical research regarding the nature of curriculum and in-service programs in either British or American centers".

Lickona and Hasch (1976) observed that insofar as research on the impact of teachers' centres was concerned "the American track record was not much better than the British, but it is improving". They identified the first "serious study" of American teachers centres as that undertaken by a team of researchers from Education Testing Service (Chittenden, et al, 1973) who interviewed fifteen teachers attending the Workshop Center for Open Education

at City College of New York. They attempted to codify the nature of learning and carry-over into the classroom (64% of instances of teacher learning included references to implementation in the teacher's own classroom). Teachers least sure of themselves appeared to implement the most, while those who were more confident were more selective about what they implemented and more attentive to how children responded.

Other research studies of single centres were reported by Lickona and Hirsch, including one undertaken at their own Grass Roots Teacher-Parent Resource Center at State University of New York at Courtland. The research carried out by Sharon Feiman (1975a and b) at the Teacher Curriculum Work Center in Chicago has already been noted in Part II of this report.

Two American national surveys are notable - that conducted by the Syracuse Teacher Center Project (Yarger et al, 1974) and the study undertaken during 1974-75 by Devaney and Thorn (1975) of some 40 U.S. centres identified with the informal education movement and which had drawn on the British experience.

The vital question of the impact of teachers' centres on teachers and students in the classroom has still to be answered.

2. CHICKEN OR THE EGG - CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT OR IN-SERVICE TRAINING?

Educators in both America and Britain have agreed that educational reform or change can only be brought about by the classroom teacher. The question would appear to be - at whose initiative?

If one accepts the rationale, it does not necessarily follow that teachers must be the initiators of the reform. They have only to be convinced of the validity of the objectives, program, methods, etc. In other words, it is understanding and the comfort level of the individual with what he is doing that brings acceptance. Such an indoctrination process would appear to be the basis for American teachers' centres; the training aspects are emphasized, usually, as has been stated, with a particular philosophy in mind, and almost to the total exclusion of curriculum development by teachers.

The overlap between the two functions has been discussed in the section outlining the functions of British centres. The distinction would seem to be blurred because there has been for some time a tradition of involving teachers directly in curriculum development. Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6 (1970) defined the two processes as seen by participants in the 1969 conferences on teachers' centres:

"For a given area of learning, curriculum development was the process of defining the aims and the objectives of their teaching, the construction of methods and materials to achieve the objectives, an assessment of

"their effectiveness, and finally a feedback of these results to form a new starting point for further study. In-service training was essentially the imparting of the results of successful curriculum development and the reinforcement of that success."

It is revealing that a count of the 285 abstracts of articles and reports on teachers' centres produced from the ERIC data base indicated that only 25 had been assigned the additional descriptor "curriculum development". In other words, if one accepts the judgment of the ERIC indexers, only 25 out of 285 articles on teachers' centres dealt to any degree with curriculum development. While the ERIC data base contains mainly American material, a limited number of British references are also included. It is not surprising then that 17 of the 25 references indexed by the term "curriculum development" dealt with British teachers' centres (this number, incidentally, represented almost the total British input). Of the eight remaining American publications, most dealt with workshop situations where teachers made curriculum materials for immediate classroom needs. This may indeed be the major activity of British "curriculum development" as well (and some indications in the literature have been noted); nevertheless it reinforces the proposition that national perceptions of the professional abilities of teachers vary considerably.

Belief in the teacher as a change agent seems to be universal, but belief in the teacher as an initiator, designer

or arbiter of change appears to be less accepted - or acceptable, especially in the U.S.

Romero and Hierman's brief paper (1976) is one of the few that touches on the inter-relationship. Viewing the American, and particularly the institutionalized California program, they comment "the constant interaction of teacher candidates, and university and public school staff tends to energize the teaching-learning environment; but, the curriculum product is not systematically considered and improved".

Typically they view the British and American differences as a result of the political/power structure:

"What is there about the British system that directs the centre thrust toward in-service training and the scope to curriculum development? The major reason seems to lie in the organization and structure of British education. Since British schools are supported by the national government, teachers have more control over what they teach and how they teach it. Because the local power struggle is mitigated, British teachers are more willing to innovate or to go in different directions with school curriculum."

The theme of British teacher autonomy is used once again, but the explanation seems an over-simplification of a much more complex attitudinal difference.

British educators certainly have questioned whether teachers are, in fact, capable of true curriculum development, or to what extent the expectation is realistic with the

limited resources of local centres. However, in spite of these doubts, there seems to be a thread of confidence in the ability of the classroom teacher, an attitude of trust, inherent in the British system, which is lacking in the American.

One American educator in particular pinpoints this uncertainty, although the intent is quite different. Steinaker (1976) entitled his article "Ten Years Hence: The Curriculum Development and Usage Center". In 1986, he foresaw a great "professionalization" of teachers, increased community involvement, more individual teacher curriculum choice, and the emergence of paraprofessionals. Within the decade, teachers will:

- have a performance-based teacher education program or equivalent post-credential education
- possess functional skills in diagnostic and prescriptive teaching
- be able to plan for individual, small groups and total groups on a short term or long-term basis
- function as an education resource person rather than dispensers of knowledge and information
- use teaching resources of many kinds and varieties rather than texts
- see curriculum as needs fulfillment rather than prescribed data

At this point, the present "teacher centres" will become "curriculum development and usage centers". One

might speculate how all these qualities which are apparently now lacking in the profession are going to be acquired in a decade, particularly with many of the same people remaining in the system (except perhaps through in-service training). Whether the concept is realistic or not, the article is enlightening because it suggests that skills necessary for curriculum development are not presently within the capability of most American teachers.

Whether the majority of teachers on either side of the Atlantic are comfortable with or want further involvement with curriculum has also been questioned. Professional development and experience are important factors in building confidence and teachers' centres have been seen by a number of observers as filling this need. It is unclear if British teachers are simply at a higher evolutionary stage than their American counterparts or whether, given vastly different educational climates, they have developed as two distinct species.

Some educators in both countries, however, have emphasized that centres themselves must go through a kind of evolutionary process in response to teachers' needs.

Owen (1972) quoted an unidentified British warden's description of the stages through which a teachers' centre has to pass and which "cannot be artificially shortened":

"The first stage is that of catering for rudimentary needs ('tips for teachers') and attempting inappropriate in-service techniques (copying existing provisions). Then the Centre begins to develop an identity and its role becomes clearer. Teachers become

"more actively involved as they learn to dispense with authoritarian leadership. As the surface needs of teachers become gratified, they become more aware of deeper needs - the need to examine critically what and why they are teaching. From this stage, I would prophesy that they will go on to want to examine critically the curriculum as a whole, and from that point to a critical look at the education system ..."

Americans Devaney and Thorn (1975) said:

"Local development may be 'reinventing the wheel' but perhaps to get good local implementation of a model, a school staff may have to apply as much re-inventing on the model 'wheel' as if they had started out to invent their own."

American educator Feiman (1977) expands on this process by pointing out the differences between the British model humanistic centre and what she classes a "developmental" centre:

"The humanistic center assumes that teacher development will occur 'naturally' as long as teachers get the help they seek and have an opportunity to pursue their own interests in a rich and supportive environment. The developmentalist recognizes that center experiences do not automatically stimulate continued growth. For that to happen teachers need time, motivation, and the tools to conceptualize their experiences and to give them personal meaning in ways which affect their beliefs and their teaching behaviour. Both humanists and developmentalists agree that teachers must be allowed to begin at their own pace. In a developmental center, however, the emphasis is less on giving practical advice and support and more on encouraging independent initiative and critical judgment, less on responding to immediate needs and more on creating awareness of basic needs which require serious work over time."

3. THE FUTURE OF TEACHERS' CENTRES AND TEACHER/TEACHING CENTERS

As has been noted, British teachers' centres are presently experiencing pressures stemming from external conditions beyond their control.

Economic constraints would at first glance appear to be a major issue, but may not in the long run be the most crucial. Although centres might well be seen by local authorities as an easy target in time of financial cutbacks, to date this has not proved to be the case (Self 1977). Frequently there is little to be saved by closing centres housed in buildings which LEA's would continue to maintain at any rate. In addition, experienced teachers who serve as wardens would be given another post in the authority; thus, savings in many cases might only involve part-time secretarial assistance and overtime for caretaking help. Commenting on the situation in Britain in mid-1977, Self stated:

"Little is therefore saved by closing a centre and this financial year will see the demise of only 14. Another 17 will change from being 'full-time' to 'part-time' (with corresponding cuts in the hours worked by the staff), and some part-time centres will be closed in Wales. But this is out of a total of some 545 centres, and is hardly more than overdue rationalization following local government reorganization."

Burrell (1976), in his critical analysis of centres stated "most LEA's clearly regard centres as a valuable asset to be maintained even in time of economic stress".

Rivalry for provision of in-service training, as has been noted, has more serious implications for centres, but the crisis in British teachers' centres, if such exists, may reflect less readily identifiable uncertainties about purpose. Self sees the real thrust to centres as "internal loss of self-confidence and sense of direction".

Burrell raised a number of highly pertinent questions which he attempted to analyze. While few answers are offered, the points are worth summarizing since they are central to defining the objectives of a centre and must realistically be faced by an agency which is contemplating establishing a centre or a network of centres

- a) What is the nature and characteristics of activities in the centre? The general impression is that in spite of rhetoric, the major activity is the traditional course, short in duration and practically based on immediate problems.
- b) To what extent does the individual's participation in a course outside the immediate environment of the school affect change or reappraisal in the classroom. Should the emphasis be school-based, that is, institutional rather than with individual needs and problems?
- c) To what extent is it possible to use the experience and expertise which teachers bring to in-service activities to the advantage of other participants. While it may be a valuable starting point, Burrell feels it is difficult

to move teachers beyond this point without skilled leadership. The problem relates to the broader issue of the place of educational theory in in-service education.

- d) To what extent are teachers able to delineate their own needs. In particular, how far are they able to distinguish between immediate "pain" needs and more long-term requirements? Immediate, identified problems are often symptomatic of much more basic problems which require intensive study, and work at the school as well as the centre. This would require considerable commitment of time, leadership, consultancy support, and would imply that:

- i) Teachers are, rather than merely should be, interested in this kind of activity. Attendance rates especially among secondary teachers raise doubts
- ii) Teachers actually want to change either themselves or the institutions in which they work. "It would seem more realistic to start from the notion that many see innovation as a source of anxiety, inadequacy and insecurity."
- iii) Teachers are able to participate in lengthy and demanding activities. Burrell comments this is patently untrue and has not been fully faced even in the James report and the government White Paper.

- iv) Wardens of centres have the time and skills to engage in the type of development work envisaged. Burrell questions the assumption that a skilled practitioner in the classroom or even a lecturer in a college or department of education can transfer into a quite different field without appropriate training.
- e) Is it possible to produce a program of activities which meets the immediate expressed needs of teachers and which is also developmental over a longer period? Programs of many centres tend to be produced on an ad hoc basis, while there is actually need for a continuum.
- f) How far is it realistic to regard centres as free agents to respond to teachers' expressed needs in the light of their relationship with the LEA which provides and therefore controls finances, facilities, etc.
- g) Should centres serve only teachers or should they include other professionals such as social workers, adult educationalists, etc. Would this antagonize teachers?
- h) How should teacher centre activities be evaluated? Burrell has no answer for this problem.
- i) What should be the relationship between teachers' centres, colleges of education and other institutions. The James report raised the question of the regional relationship of centres and other institutions, but the practical problems of networks are great. There is a need to provide for flexibility and equality of status among all agencies in the field of in-service training.

It is difficult to discuss the future of American centres as an entity because there are almost no common elements; governance, funding, purpose and functions vary widely. However, in the same way in which Burrell asked questions which must be faced by the British system or any other organization contemplating establishment of centres, some generalized observations were found in the American literature.

Vincent Rogers, writing an editorial in the March, 1976 issue of Educational Leadership which introduced a number of articles on teachers' centres, including Burrell's, commented:

"I am disturbed by a number of problems that I have confronted in my work that are not in any sense resolved in the material that follows - problems that are perhaps ignored by starry-eyed innovators anxious to be part of what may become the next American fad, problems that should be considered by anyone who sees the teacher center as a possible alternative to conventional approaches to the education of America's teachers."

Briefly, these are -

- a) Teachers' centres apparently mean many things to many people; it can be used to deliver old wine in new bottles. This may not necessarily be bad, but there should be an awareness of why and what is being done.
- b) Where should funding for centres come from? How much should local districts or teachers themselves provide? Private foundations almost always fund for a limited period of time, "federal funding is mostly negative", and it is exceedingly difficult to get "no strings attached" support from universities.

- c) What should the relationship be between teachers' centres and colleges or universities? Should teachers' centres operate as independent alternatives to conventional modes of teacher education, or should their work be viewed as an active and important appendage to a responsive school or college of education.
- d) Should teachers' centres have an educational point of view which they advocate or should they be largely eclectic?
- e) Should teachers' centres concentrate on practical day-to-day needs of teachers or should they be concerned with larger questions dealing with educational theory, research and philosophy?
- f) Should centres be so exclusive that principals and other administrators and/or specialists are excluded? Can schools change very much if this is the accepted mode?
- g) What is the role of parents?
- h) What is the role of teacher unions and professional organizations?
- i) Is there a place for the secondary school teacher in the teachers' centre?
- j) How can centres attract reluctant teachers?
- k) How can centres avoid the randomness which seems to dominate their offerings and instead provide more coherent, sustained and continuous help for teachers?
- l) If educators such as Goodlad and Perrone believe the

individual school is the best change unit, how can centres work more effectively with schools rather than randomly with individual teachers who may become discouraged in a hostile school environment?

- m) How can teachers' centres become places that produce "a climate for change" - rather than a product?

While the questions raised by the two educators express some common concerns and some unique to their own national environment, they also identify general problems of purpose which teachers' centres anywhere must resolve.

Burrell has, at least, loosened some of the foundation stones of British teachers' centres. Pressures created by external social and economic conditions may force teachers' centres out of what has been termed the "cottage industry era". However, it is also possible that stronger leadership, more coordinated and cohesive programs, and closer relationship with other educational institutions and the community, might destroy the unique quality of British centres based on flexibility, informality, localism and teacher autonomy - and propel them, for better or worse, closer to their more highly institutionalized American counterparts.

PART IV - THE ONTARIO EXPERIENCE

Little is available in the Canadian journal literature on Ontario teachers' centres. Therefore, this section of the report is based largely on files made available by the Ontario Teachers' Federation office in Toronto, and deals in particular with the difficulties experienced in an attempt to establish teachers' centres in one northern area of the province.

In addition, a brief overview of the Ontario educational environment is included, especially in reference to curriculum; no attempt is made to cover the major issues of teacher education and in-service training.

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Americans were not alone on the bandwagon. Canadian, and specifically Ontario, educators also climbed aboard, no less influenced by Bailey's article than their U.S. counterparts.

In order to bring the provincial situation into focus and to relate it to British and American experiences, it is worthwhile to briefly review some of Ontario's activities over the past six years.

The initiative for the development of teachers' centres in the British model would appear to have been taken by Dr. K.F. Prueter, then coordinator of Field Development of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, supported by Dr. Wilfred Wees. Dr. Wees' paper "Continuing Education for Teachers: Teachers' Centres" (1972), resulting from a visit

to Britain, outlined the growth of British centres and positive and negative factors which he identified through observation and in his discussions with wardens. Commenting on the educational environment in Ontario, he said:

"For the past hundred years, the teacher's responsibility had been to teach what he was told to teach, when and how he was told to teach it. And the educational generations of men who had inherited Ryerson's testament had so refined and integrated Ryerson's imported system that for the teachers there was no way out of the bind. The new responsibilities of teachers represent a radical change. Teachers now are to be held accountable for the personal growth of each child ---"

The most serious roadblock to acceptance of this new accountability, Wees felt, was the insecurity of the teacher, together with pressures from "certain people in universities, teachers' colleges and faculties of education, among parents, educational administrators, consultants, and even in Departments of Education (who) may all have their own techniques by which to restrict, repress, subvert a teacher's attempt to renounce the old in favour of the new". For those who believe that change in education "cannot occur except as the teacher implements it", he continued, a way must be found "to encourage, support and propose directions for all those teachers on the verge of commitment to their new responsibilities".

Wees mentioned, as American observers have repeatedly, the classroom autonomy of the British teacher, while "in Canada, on the other hand, the directive power of the administrations has been so strong that teachers often still feel that they need permission to change" - and - "complaints by three or four vocal parents can sound like and be heard as

"the voice of the whole community. Parental involvement in the change process is an almost certain assurance of acceptance".

These comments have been quoted at some length because, if they represent an accurate assessment of the status of the Ontario teacher within society and in relation to the academic community, the description closely resembles the American teacher as previously discussed. Nowhere in the British literature are found such strong expressions of concern for the vulnerability of individual teachers to outside pressures.

It is interesting too that Dr. Wees' paper emphasized the training function of centres through provision of programs. However, he commends the fact that "a program for a term is generally constituted of the proposals and requests of teachers". He criticized British centres' programming for:

- a) lack of thematic approach - a tendency towards "helter-skelter activities"
- b) study periods on topics too short and too few in number to permit effective progress
- c) programs over-rich in "how-to-do-it" topics and under nourishing in conceptual thinking
- f) topic sessions too heavily spiked with lectures

Dr. Wees concluded:

"To extend our thinking about continuing education for teachers beyond the teachers' centres, a thorough going study of the subject should be made.

Teachers' centres can only be one component (though a major one) in the promotion of teachers' continuous inquiry into education.

As in American articles, papers and reports, there is no prominence given to the words "curriculum development" which appear so frequently in the British literature. Nor is there the emphasis on "teacher control" which is an on-going British concern, although Wees does comment that "in setting up a teachers' centre board, whatever the composition, the teachers should be the majority".

In typically Canadian fashion, Ontario educators drew on both American and British sources. Two prominent names appear frequently: Stephen Bailey, the American educator who started the bandwagon rolling, and Harry Kahn, the articulate, enthusiastic warden of Enfield Centre in England. The idea may have filtered through the American literature, but the post-1971 Ontario commitment was to the British "teachers' centre" - or at least to the Canadian interpretation of that model.

In May and June of 1972, Prueter met in Timmins, Ontario, as reported in his paper "A Teacher-Centred Approach to Curriculum and Professional Development", with directors, superintendents and teacher representatives from the portion of Ministry of Education Region 3 lying north of the district of Nipissing.

It was agreed that a teacher-centred approach would be

developed in which teachers "in consultation with their administrators" would identify local needs and plan a response to those needs, "with the assured cooperation of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Ministry of Education, the Ontario Teachers' Federation and the Ontario Association of Educational Administrative Officials". Planned activities were to be directed to K-13 initially, but post-secondary institutions would be invited at a later date. Activities would also be responsive to needs of both French and English language schools.

The area was divided into four sub-areas involving twelve boards. From Porquois Junction, which represented the centre of the area, distance ranged from 40 miles to Timmins to 210 miles to Moosonee. In each area teachers were to choose one representative who for two days each month would serve as a curriculum and professional development officer for the sub-area. In addition, each would serve on a central committee, together with an OISE coordinator. OISE reimbursed boards for twenty days of released time in the amount of \$600 per board. It was suggested that each sub-area might set up a council of teachers to identify local interests.

To assume responsibility for planning a coordinated effort on the part of the local school systems, OISE, the Ministry, the OTF and the OAEAO, the Institute agreed to appoint a half-time residential coordinator. This coordinator would be a teacher selected by the Timmins District

R.C.S.S. Board and the Timmins Board of Education.

In "A Teacher-Centred Approach to Curriculum and Professional Development - Paper No. 2", Dr. Prueter reported, as of September 11, 1972, that three out of four sub-areas had named development officers, and a local coordinator had been selected. Senior educational administration officials had given full support to the project plan and had involved their teachers from the beginning. Local OTF affiliates had endorsed the proposal in principle. "Teachers, or some of them at least, are prepared to assume their responsibilities in curriculum and professional development". Dr. Prueter concluded his remarks with Stephen Bailey's rationale:

- a) fundamental educational reform will come only through those charged with the basic educational responsibility: to wit, the teachers
- b) teachers are unlikely to change their ways of doing things just because imperious, theoretical reformers tell them to shape up
- c) teachers will take reform seriously only when they are responsible for defining their own needs, and receiving help on their own terms and turf

In October of 1972, Rev. Frank Kavanaugh, the OTF representative, reported on a meeting held in Timmins with the coordinator, sub-area representatives, Dr. Prueter and the Associate Regional Director from the Ministry of Education. He commented that the movement "boded well", but there was

a discordant note in his comments:

"The first portion of the meeting was spent in erasing the considerable confusion in the group's mind re OISE participation. To the date of this meeting, all members were viewing their role as participants in a Regional OISE field office. The cold hard fact that a Teacher Centre was the vision was grasped as well as the idea that the project was to be initiated by teachers and for teachers for the betterment of the educational process. Assistance would be available from OTP, the Ministry and OISE. The theme was stated, restated and orchestrated by the three resource people present."

By January of 1973, Wees in a memorandum to Prueter reported that, in a meeting held in Timmins on January 23, 1973, the attitude of the coordinator and the three representatives (apparently a fourth had still not been appointed) was "one of a very low-ebb discouragement", although after airing their troubles for several hours, they began to think more positively. The main reasons for this discouragement were:

- a) Teacher apathy - one representative said that only 20% of teachers were interested in "self-improvement"
- b) "thinking teachers, who propose projects, skip the representative and go directly to their own selections for resource help"
- c) Lack of money
- d) Communications were too slow
- e) There was nothing for French teachers
- f) Representatives were unable to create a credibility gap between teachers and OISE. In staff rooms they "seldom hear anything good about OISE"

Dr. Wees felt the main problem was that teachers saw representatives as OISE people, not their own people. One representative commented that if teachers themselves would really put their minds to it and make proposals to the board, he felt the boards who were already spending considerable money on "professional development" would seriously consider the idea.

In the same month, Sudbury opened a "teacher centre", with the regional Ministry of Education, the Sudbury Board, OISE, the OTP, Laurentian University and Cambrian College providing support and resources. Committees to work on special education and preschool education were established.

In the meantime, plans for a proposed OTP study tour of British teachers' centres fell through, but correspondence had been initiated between the federation and Harry Kahn. Production of a film on British teachers' centres, in cooperation with the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, was under discussion. Plans were set up under Mr. Kahn's auspices for visits to three locations - North Ealing, Rachel McMillan and Enfield. In the spring of 1973 two films were shot - one at Rachel McMillan and one at Enfield.

The OTP was also enthusiastically planning a conference on teachers' centres for September of 1973, which OISE agreed to sponsor jointly. Harry Kahn was to be guest speaker and the films produced by the OECA were to be shown. Stephen Bailey, now with the American Council for Education, was unable to attend.

The conference was attended by some 150 educators. Oliver and Wees (1973) reported the general consensus was that while many of the activities of centres were already happening in the school setting, centres could provide teachers with opportunity to share ideas with a wider population of colleagues and a better equipped, more comfortable and more liberating environment than the school base. The focus would be in-service training, with curriculum and professional development as complementary aspects. Centres should be run by teachers for teachers and attendance should be voluntary. Support would have to come from external agencies and "paper credits would not be part of the deal".

Because the centre concept continued to be of interest, the OTF undertook a provincial survey in the summer of 1976. All school boards were asked to provide information. Of the total, 34 boards did not reply, 109 said that they had no centres and no plans for such facilities; 38 boards provided descriptions of centres and future plans.

In the introduction to The Current State of Teacher Centre Development in Ontario, which reported the findings of the survey, Des Dixon, Executive Assistant, Curriculum and Professional Development for the OTF, remarked:

"In the classic British model of the Teacher Centre governance and administration is in the hands of an independent board of directors, the majority of whom are teachers elected by teachers. This is absolutely essential. Funding is from the public purse. That is absolutely essential. The main function of the Centre is to provide professional development activities for teachers and to contribute to local curriculum development. That is absolutely essential."

In spite of the centres reported in existence in Ontario, Dixon concluded that, although the British experience could be remarkably effective:

"It has not been the Ontario experience. Nowhere in the province has a school board funded a Teacher Centre governed and administered by an independent board of directors the majority of whom are teachers elected by teachers. Nowhere in Ontario have educators and elected officials decided to have faith, to embrace the concept, to be determined that it shall work. Instead we have a number of Centres throughout the province directly governed and administered by school boards. No doubt many, perhaps all, are well run and make a contribution."

It is difficult, of course, to evaluate centres from the tabulation (a copy of the report of the survey is included in Appendix II). However, a large percentage would appear to operate mainly as resource centres or libraries, while the few that have attempted programming or discussion groups are inadequately staffed and financed.

2. THE ONTARIO ENVIRONMENT

The Ontario Ministry of Education espoused a decentralized education system more than a decade ago. As a consequence, while the Ministry articulated the philosophical framework and board guidelines and the regional officers interpreted its policies, programs and curriculum guidelines to boards, curriculum development became largely a local responsibility.

In addition, the government committed itself to a philosophy that the educational system would provide for individual differences and would allow each student to develop to the maximum of his or her potential.

The climate now appears to be one of judicious compromise. Public concern of parents, postsecondary educators and employers for the education system's apparent neglect of the "basics", resulted in the Ministry designating certain compulsory "core curriculum" courses for all intermediate students (Grades 9 and 10). At the same time, in response to local boards' alarm that their commitment in time, money and people to curriculum development would be wasted, the Minister of Education stressed that the ministry was not reverting to a "definitive, lock step curriculum"; the more prescriptive and descriptive guidelines would simply help "to clarify and simplify the challenge of local curriculum development". (Wells, Jan.1, 1977)

The Ministry's Circular H.S. 1 1977-78, Secondary School Diploma Requirements, referring to the core program, stated the responsibility of local authorities:

"perceptions concerning the relative value of a particular subject or course vary from community to community, and from school to school, from teacher to teacher, and from student to student. The need to provide students with the skills, perspectives, attitudes and understanding that will allow them to participate richly and wisely in the life of this province and this country can be fulfilled in different ways through various subject areas. It is considered appropriate, therefore, for each school to develop or adapt its own curriculum to meet the needs, interests and abilities of the students of its community."

As far as elementary education is concerned, the Ministry stated in its 1975 publication, The Formative Years (Circular P1J1) that "while the Ministry articulates the broad goals, it is the responsibility of the local school boards - through their supervisory officials - to formulate local programs that are within the rationale of provincial policy and at the same time reflect local needs and priorities". Even more emphatically, it specified - "the major responsibility for planning curriculum rests with the school. Only by accepting this responsibility can it respond to the special needs and characteristics of the children in its care, and work towards achieving the aims of the school and school system".

As for teachers themselves, The Formative Years commented that "individual teachers have the responsibility for selecting strategies, resources and activities appropriate to the needs of individual children". At the secondary level, the teacher shares in the awesome responsibility of creating "members of society who will think clearly, feel deeply and act wisely". (H.S. 1 1977-78).

To reinforce its concept of local involvement in curriculum (and presumably to appease boards), input and writing committees and advisory and validation committees, composed mainly of teachers and school administrators (selected by the OTF and Regional Offices), together with a few ministry regional officers and colleges of education faculty, were designated to participate in the creation of the new "core" guidelines. In addition, a series of Curriculum Ideas for Teachers, prepared by local teachers, to support the guidelines was initiated. This policy was in direct contrast to the province's previous guidelines which had been issued as anonymous ministry publications.

The Ministry stance currently operates within an uneasy environment, not only of public concern for educational results, but of declining enrolment and consequent redundancy of teachers, buildings and equipment; public dissatisfaction with government spending at all levels; periodic unrest created by demands of teachers' associations and local bargaining units; and a growing disillusionment with change and innovation, resulting in an emotional nostalgia for a return to the past.

In addition, financing of boards of education, largely through local tax support, makes Ontario school systems, educational administrators and teachers highly vulnerable to criticism and pressure groups. It is also possible that the public's confidence, or lack of it, in the teachers' professional ability, may more closely resemble the American

than the British attitude. Finally, Canadian educational research is highly influenced by the results of American research; there is a constant intra-continental exchange of ideas through journals and conferences; and there has been considerable migration of American academics to Canadian institutions. All of these factors contribute to the likelihood that the Canadian research and academic community's attitude is closely akin to American paternalism.

As the target of such pressures and attitudes, coupled with the responsibility of coping with frequently apathetic and reluctant students, it is not surprising that classroom teachers are sometimes resentful and suspicious of further change. Such a defensive position quite naturally leads to local bargaining units becoming increasingly protective of the use of teachers' time or expertise for services other than those contracted for.

One final observation should be made about the Ontario environment in a very literal sense. Any system or facilities must take into account the province's variations in geography and climate. The narrow southern band of relatively dense urban or suburban population contrasts sharply with the northern area where distances between urban centres are greater and winter driving more hazardous.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is not within the scope of this report to analyze either the philosophy that fundamental educational reform will only come about through classroom teachers, or the implications of teachers' centres in the British model for Ontario. However, a few tentative observations follow based on conclusions drawn from the literature.

Obviously the ultimate contact in any educational system, regardless of whether it is centralized and highly controlled or decentralized and flexible, is between teacher and students. The crux would appear to be how the philosophy is implemented.

In Britain, there is sufficient trust and confidence in the professional judgment and ability of the teacher to allow a certain independence in decisions regarding their own developmental needs and those of their students. In addition, as has been seen, many teachers' centres were an outgrowth of local teachers' involvement in national curriculum projects. This tradition is reinforced by the existence of the Schools Council which, regardless of the extent of its activities, nevertheless reflects a national confidence in the profession. The structure of the British educational system is also such that it permits centres, politically and financially, to maintain a degree of independence and neutrality.

By contrast, American attitudes towards the profession

would appear to derive from entirely different traditions. This, together with the fact that funding usually implies some kind of "strings", has resulted in centres which, regardless of whether they are institutionalized or "open" and independent, usually have "training" of teachers based on the educational philosophy or instructional methods of the funding agency as their main function.

Thus, a philosophy, planted in two different soils has produced two distinct varieties - the British teachers' centre and the American teacher/teaching center. What kind of hybrid the Ontario soil might produce is difficult to estimate based on sporadic efforts to date. However, indications are that many of the power pressures and attitudes which are prevalent in the U.S. also exist in Canada.

The American experience demonstrates the difficulty of taking a method or concept from one environment and transplanting it to another. The impact on the new environment must be examined, as well as its ability to accept the concept. Usually, either the transplant must be altered to suit the existing structure, or the structure must be changed to enable the concept to flourish.

From reviewing the literature, it would seem that four essential factors should be present in setting up centres :

- 1) a clearly defined purpose (whether it is to allow teachers freedom to identify and fill their own needs, or whether it is undertaken by another agency)

- 2) a political/economic/cultural environment which will permit the purpose to be fulfilled
- 3) acceptance of the purpose by teachers, educational administrators, politicians, local government, public, etc.
- 4) realistic expectations in keeping with the administrative set-up and the capabilities of those involved.

As for the operation of individual centres, at least four factors appear to be essential:

- 1) Money - sufficient to provide suitable facilities; a full-time warden, coordinator or leader; and clerical assistance
- 2) Time - a) for the coordinator to actively pursue his role
 b) for teachers in the form of some release time to enable them to actively participate with some kind of continuity
 c) for the evolution of the centre which, as has been pointed out by various educators, is a slow process which cannot be by-passed
- 3) Leadership
- 4) A Neutral Environment (at least to the extent which it is possible to provide)

The third factor, leadership, is perhaps the most essential and the most difficult requirement to fill. The successful coordinator or warden has to be a rare breed combining

a number of qualities which would include:

- a) ability to relate to and gain the respect of teachers, administrators and the academic and research community
- b) sensitivity to teachers' needs and the ability to perceive individual needs within the context of a greater whole
- c) ability to initiate and coordinate programs in response to stated or perceived needs without imposing them
- d) considerable knowledge of materials, equipment, methods, availability of courses and educational opportunities for teachers, sources of information, resource people and agencies, etc.

What are the implications of such requirements for implementation of centres in Ontario? The ministry's commitment to local curriculum development might be interpreted as encouraging the idea of centres. On the other hand, since local authorities have already geared their organizations to this purpose, how would centres relate to this structure? The ministry has emphasized school-based curriculum development, which may in actual fact, be system-based in many instances. What, if any, role is there within systems for teacher-based curriculum development?

Certainly declining enrolment could provide facilities and space to establish centres, and teacher expertise and

experience which has not previously been utilized to its potential, could be better deployed. However, the position of teachers' centre warden or leader would be extremely difficult to fill. It is doubtful whether the average or even superior teacher, department head or principal could bring the combination of skills necessary for the job without additional training. It would be unfortunate if such positions were used to make a place in a system for redundant teachers who might not have the skill, energy, impartiality and broad point of view which the job requires.

Teachers' centres, especially those which are teacher-managed, have been the target of criticism for their tendency to fill immediate "bread and butter" needs. However, it seems unrealistic to expect teachers to initiate major curriculum reform or professional development programs. It is only natural that teachers, who are involved in coping with day-to-day classroom problems, perceive their needs in a limited dimension. Such "bread and butter" activities might be considered as a first-level function of centres.¹ Coordinators or wardens could play an important role in second-level activities by perceiving individual and specific needs as part of a more general lack of information or training. Programs or working parties could be suggested by coordinators

¹It is suggested that this semi-therapeutic type of assistance may, in the long run, have more positive influence in the classroom than structured and goal-oriented programs; however, such a suggestion is of course open to question and difficult, if not impossible, to validate.

which might assist in broadening teachers' horizons and putting them in touch with resources, people or institutions of which they might otherwise not be aware.

There is also a tendency for centres which lack sufficiently skilled and active leadership and time for participation, to become passive and little-used resource centres. It is far better to expend time and money on activity other than collecting and organizing of materials.

Financing would seem to be another difficult problem to resolve. It is unlikely that local boards of education would be willing to finance centres to the extent necessary to make them effective. In addition, this kind of financial support makes centres vulnerable to local public criticism and control, possibly by a highly vocal minority. It is difficult to conceive that citizens who consider professional development days as a "frill", would support the idea of teachers' centres which might even include some kind of social activity.

The only viable alternative would appear to be a provincial financial incentive to boards who are willing to provide space for centres. Again, however, this would be a political issue open to public criticism that such centres were being established to provide jobs or fill in the time of redundant teachers. Within the present climate, it would seem that the concept could only be "sold" to the public if it could be directly related to results in the schools.

One possible alternative to the immediate development of

centres is an interim step of greater involvement by classroom teachers at all levels, from elementary to post-secondary, in defining the province's educational objectives and in planning in the specific areas of teacher education, professional development and inservice training, and curriculum development. There would appear to be much to be gained from the experience of those who are in daily direct contact with students.

Some type of provincial or local councils, possibly with participation by parents, might be an initial step in fostering both the public's and the teachers' own confidence in their professionalism. Teachers' centres might evolve from such councils in areas where results were sufficiently positive to warrant more long-term participation and the establishment of a permanent facility for planning and development.

APPENDIX I

AN EXHIBITION at the Teachers' Centre

129

Appendix I

NEEDLECRAFT AIDS

MONDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER.

This Exhibition of Needlecraft Aids for use in Primary and Secondary Schools will include:

SEWING MACHINES and EDUCATIONAL AIDS

supplied by Bernina, Elna, Frister Rossman, Singer and Viking

NEEDLECRAFT BOOKS published by Batsford, Mills & Boon and Studio Vista

NEEDLECRAFT 'bundles' and books distributed by Nottingham Handcraft.

This is a unique opportunity for teachers to see and try for themselves a range of simple and sophisticated sewing machines. It will also be possible to examine a collection of recently edited Needlecraft books.

ORGANISER: Miss M. Greaves, Home Economics Adviser

OPENS 15. 30

CLOSES 18. 30.

WELCOME TO TEACHERS

The Chairman of the Education Committee and Chief Education Officer's

WELCOME TO TEACHERS

appointed since 1st September, 1974.

MONDAY, 22ND SEPTEMBER

REFRESHMENTS

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES:-

130

SUPER DISCO & LIGHT SHOW

FRIDAY 26TH SEPTEMBER

at
20.00
'til
late.

CEILIDH

FOLK DANCE EVENING

with
ETCetera

20. 00

RAFFLE

DUPLICATE BRIDGE

AUTUMN TERM TOURNAMENTS

TUESDAY 21ST OCTOBER

THURSDAY 27TH NOVEMBER

at 19.30

P R I Z E S

BONFIRE NIGHT

BONFIRE - FIREWORKS - SPARKLERS

FOR THE CHILDREN - MUSIC - SOUP

AND HOT DOGS - RAFFLE (etc.)

from 19. 00

BAR AND REFRESHMENTS AVAILABLE AT ALL FUNCTIONS

Application Forms to Follow

DIARY OF BOOKINGS OF THE CENTRE FOR COURSES,

WORKING PARTIES, COMMITTEES AND OTHER ORGANISATIONS.

8th September Monday	Swimming Teachers	14. 30
10th September Wednesday	Bar and Social Sub-Committee	16. 30
	Art & Craft 'Fortnight' Working Party	16. 30
11th September Thursday	H.M. Inspectors' Meeting	10. 30
	'Language in the Primary School' Discussion Group	16. 30
15th September Monday	Enfield Association of Remedial Teachers Working Party	16. 30
	Local Resources Working Party - 'Leaway'	16. 30
	'A' Level Home Economics Discussion Group	16. 30
16th September Tuesday	Reading Materials Production Working Party	16. 30
	Secondary Working Party	16. 30
17th September Wednesday	L.B.E.Primary Schools Netball Association A.G.M.	16. 30
	Editorial Sub-Committee	16. 30
	Teachers' Committee	16. 30
18th September Thursday	Enfield Borough Savings Committee	14. 30 - 16. 00
22nd September Monday	First Appointments Meeting	15. 00
	WELCOME to Teachers	16. 30
23rd September Tuesday	Enfield Association of Remedial Teachers A.G.M.	16. 30
	Heads of Departments of Physical Education	16. 45
	(Women)	- 18. 00
24th September Wednesday	N.U.T. Committee	16. 30
	Long Course Selection Committee	17. 30
26th September Friday	Open University Tutorial	19. 00
	Disco and Light Show	- 20. 30 20. 00

29th September Monday	Home Economics Exhibition	15.30 -18.30
30th September Tuesday	Physical Education First Appointments in Secondary Schools (Women)	16.45
1st October Wednesday	Teachers' Committee "Language across the Curriculum" Meeting	16.30 16.30
6th October Monday	A.T.O. - D.E.S. Course - Reading 5-13 Session I	16.30
7th October Tuesday	Programme Sub-Committee A.T.O. - D.E.S. Course - The Structure of the Curriculum in Primary Education - Session 1 Physical Education Women Teachers in Secondary Schools	14.00 16.30 16.45 -18.00
9th October Thursday	N.U.T. Welcome to New Appointments	17.00
10th October Friday	Open University Tutorial	19.00 -20.30
13th October Monday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course A.T.O. - D.E.S. Course - Reading 5-13 Session II Local Resources Working Party - 'Leaway' Education towards Parenthood	09.00 -16.00 16.30 16.30 16.45
14th October Tuesday	A.T.O. - D.E.S. Course - The Structure of the Curriculum in Primary Education - Session II	16.30
15th October Wednesday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course Infant Teachers' Discussion Group Folk Dance Ceilidh	09.00 -16.00 16.30 20.00
16th October Thursday	N.U.T. Committee	16.30

17th October Friday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	09. 00 - 16. 00
20th October Monday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	16. 30 - 18. 30
	A.T.O.-D.E.S. Course - Reading 5-13 Session III	16. 30
	Education Towards Parenthood	16. 45
21st October Tuesday	C.S.E. (English)	15. 00
	Duplicate Bridge Tournament	19. 30
22nd October Wednesday	Mathematics Paper No. 5 'Closure, etc.'	
	Discussion Group	16. 30
3rd November Monday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	16. 30 - 18. 30
	A.T.O.-D.E.S. Course - Reading 5-13 Session IV	16. 30
	Education Towards Parenthood	16. 45
4th November Tuesday	A.T.O.-D.E.S.Course - The Structure of the Curriculum in Primary Education Session 3	16. 30
5th November Wednesday	N.U.T. Committee	16. 30
	Guy Fawkes' Night at the Centre	19. 00
10th November Monday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	16. 30 - 18. 30
	A.T.O.-D.E.S.Course Reading 5-13 Session V	16. 30
	Local Resources Working Party - 'Leaway'	16. 30
	Education Towards Parenthood	16. 45
11th November Tuesday	A.T.O.-D.E.S. Course - The Structure of the Curriculum in Primary Education Session IV	16. 30
12th November Wednesday	Advisory Committee	16. 30
14th November Friday	Wardens in the South East (WISE) AGM	10. 00 - 15. 00

17th November Monday	Infant Mathematics Course	09. 00
		- 15. 30
	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	16. 30
		- 18. 30
	A.T.O.-D.E.S.Course - Reading 5-13 Session VI	16. 30
	Education Towards Parenthood	16. 45
18th November Tuesday	Infant Mathematics Course	09. 00
		- 15. 30
	A.T.O.-D.E.S.Course - The Structure of the Curriculum in Primary Education, Session V	16. 30
19th November Wednesday	Infant Mathematics Course	09. 00
		- 15. 30
20th November Thursday	Infant Mathematics Course	09. 00
		- 15. 30
21st November Friday	Infant Mathematics Course	09. 00
		- 15. 30
24th November Monday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	16. 30
		- 18. 30
	Education towards Parenthood	16. 45
25th November Tuesday	A.T.O.-D.E.S. Course - the Structure of the Curriculum in Primary Education, Session VI	16. 30
26th November Wednesday	Teachers' Committee	16. 30
27th November Thursday	Duplicate Bridge Tournament	19. 30
1st December Monday	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	16. 30
		- 18. 30
	Education Towards Parenthood	16. 45
4th December Thursday	Mathematics Paper No. 6 - Discussion Group	16. 30

8th December	The Disadvantaged Child - Course	16. 30
Monday		- 18. 30
	Local Resources Working Party - 'Leeway'	16. 30
9th December	N.U.T. Committee	16. 30
Tuesday		

LICENSED BAR

THE BAR AT THE TEACHERS' CENTRE WILL BE OPEN THIS TERM AT THE FOLLOWING TIMES

Mondays	8.00 - 10. 00 pm
Wednesdays	8.00 - 10. 00 pm
Daily	1. At the end of evening courses and activities as required.
	2. At lunch time when all day activities are in progress

Some sample prices:-

Rayment's Keg Bitter	20p (pint)
Harp Lager	15p
Autumn Gold Cider	10p
Cinzano	18p

Open Evenings

The Centre is open each Monday and Wednesday evening (8.00 - 10.00) for teachers with their friends to come and relax in an informal atmosphere.

The following activities are available:-

TABLE TENNIS	BRIDGE (Beginners and all standards)	CHESS
DRAUGHTS	SCRABBLE	SHOVE HA'PENNY
TELEVISION BBC1 and 2 and ITV		

Refreshments

Refreshments available at the Centre:-

Tea or Coffee	3p	Baked Beans on Toast	8p
Tea & Biscuits	5p	Spaghetti on Toast	8p
Coffee & Biscuits	5p	Egg on Toast	10p
Squash & Biscuits	5p	Toast & Butter (slice)	4p

(Prices subject to alteration as necessary, without prior notice)

FOR ALL DAY COURSES THE ABOVE ITEMS ARE ALWAYS AVAILABLE FOR TEACHERS WISHING TO HAVE THEIR LUNCH AT THE CENTRE.



The Current State of TEACHER CENTRE DEVELOPMENT in Ontario

THE RESULTS OF A SURVEY OF ALL ONTARIO SCHOOL BOARDS CONDUCTED BY THE EDUCATIONAL STUDIES COMMITTEE OF THE ONTARIO
TEACHERS' FEDERATION AND PUBLISHED IN OCTOBER 1976.

THE ONTARIO TEACHERS' FEDERATION 1260 BAY STREET, TORONTO, ONTARIO M5R 2B5

INTRODUCTION

- R. G. Des Dixon, Executive Assistant, Curriculum & Professional Development, Ontario Teachers' Federation

A Teacher Centre is not a building; it is a concept. The building in which the concept is realized is of secondary importance.

And the concept is just this: the professional development of teachers and the development of local curriculum, both at public expense, can best be accomplished if they are placed as an act of faith largely in the hands of teachers.

In the classic British model of the Teacher Centre governance and administration is in the hands of an independent board of directors the majority of whom are teachers elected by teachers. That is absolutely essential. Funding is from the public purse. That is absolutely essential. The main function of the Centre is to provide professional development activities for teachers and to contribute to local curriculum development. That is absolutely essential. All else is optional.

Given a community of people determined to make the concept work, the Teacher Centre can be remarkably effective. This has been the British experience.

It has not been the Ontario experience because the concept has not yet been tried here. Nowhere in this province has a school board funded a Teacher Centre governed and administered by an independent board of directors the majority of whom are teachers elected by teachers. Nowhere in Ontario have educators and elected officials decided to have faith, to embrace the concept, to be determined that it shall work.

Instead we have a number of Centres throughout the province directly governed and administered by school boards. No doubt many, perhaps all, are well run and make a contribution. A list of such Centres is attached.

In the summer of 1976 OTF asked all school boards in Ontario to provide information about their Teacher Centres. 34 boards did not reply. 109 boards said they have no Teacher Centre and no plans. 38 boards provided descriptions of their Centres and future plans.

We wish to thank responding school boards for their generous co-operation in making it possible for OTF to provide this statement of the current state of Teacher Centre development in the province of Ontario.

Toronto
October 1, 1976

APPENDIX II

TEACHER CENTRE SURVEY

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es)	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Governance and Administration
Atikokan RCSS Atikokan P0T 1C0 T. B. Cox, Secretary- Treasurer No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Integration of school & public libraries with high school library as a resource centre open in evenings.	Board of education, public library & separate school board.	Supply information & resource materials - books, A.V., etc. to teachers on request.	Regular administration of schools & libraries.
Cochrane-Iroquois Falls Iroquois Falls P0K 1G0 D. Powell, Director of Education No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	A four room school in the geographic centre of our school system was closed because of declining enrolment in the jurisdiction. The building was kept for its potential.	The board pays for caretaking costs & is continuing to pay off debentures.	The Teacher/Board Liaison Committee uses it for meetings; has been used for various workshops; frequently used as a meeting place for salary negotiations.	Centre is offered for use as a meeting place for any teacher group but because distance involved is 30 miles it is seldom used. The key can be obtained upon request at the board office.
Dryden Box 3006 Dryden P8N 2H4 A. P. Sinclair, Director of Education No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	June 1/73. Materials collected in system as a foundation. This has been constantly upgraded each year to present. Catalogue of materials available.	Board budget through Supt. of Ed. & System Co-ordinators.	- distribution of all materials - preparation of resource kits - teacher visits.	Control through Supt. of Ed. & System Co-ordinators. Actual cataloguing done by Mrs. P. Norman, Secretary to the System Co-ordinators.
Dufferin-Peel RCSS 100 Dundas Street West Mississauga L5B 1H6 J. Hugel, Director of Education No. of Centres: 2 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Initially developed to need expressed by Primary teachers for materials to be used in classrooms, was eventually extended to include Junior grades, and will probably be extended to include Intermediate grades in the future.	Board financed.	- prepare teacher aids - circulation of professional books & other curriculum support materials - teachers use Centre as a call-in base to get materials which are theme oriented - exchange of ideas from within and outside the system.	The A.V. Centre is governed by an A.V. Co-ordinator & the other Centre is governed by a Library Resource Teacher.
Etobicoke 1 Civic Centre Court Etobicoke M9C 2B3 J. W. Bedell, Supt. of Curriculum Services No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Established by the Etobicoke Bd. when the Education Centre was opened in 1969. As vacant classrooms became available, satellite areas for Math, Early Childhood Ed., Geography & Science were established.	Curriculum Services Branch budget.	- in-service programs - professional development - meetings of curriculum committees - task forces & work groups.	Administered by Supt. of Curriculum Services & program committee of branch.
Frontenac-Lennox & Addington County RCSS 84 Stephen Street Kingston K7K 2C4 F. J. Fowler, Supt. of Schools No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	The original idea of setting up a Teacher Centre came from Mr. Fowler, Supt. of Schools for the board. A committee of four people was set up to look into the idea. The committee was made up of the supt. of schools, a principal and two resource teachers. This committee gathered as much printed material as possible on the concept of Teacher Centres and it also made a trip to London, Ontario to have a look at and talk to the people who run a teacher centre for London Separate School Board. This trip proved to be most worthwhile in the setting up of our Teacher Centre.	The Teacher Centre was financed by a LIP grant and also was supported by the school board for its first year of operation. This year it is being supported by the school board and a request is being made to OECTA for additional funds.	The Teacher Centre operated with a staff of three teachers. They spent Monday and Friday at the Centre collecting materials and books, making activities, and setting up workshops & activity centres. The remainder of the week (Tues., Wed. & Thurs.) they acted as a teacher-relief, while a classroom teacher came to the Centre for the day. The visiting teacher was free from the classroom to make activities, collect ideas & materials, & talk with other teachers. The Teacher Centre also offered interest workshops in the evening. This year the Centre will operate in a similar manner.	Last year the Teacher Centre was run by the four committee members mentioned in question two of this questionnaire, in co-operation with the three teacher-relief staff members mentioned in the Main Activities section. This year the Teacher Centre will be run by a teacher-co-ordinator whose full time job will be to look after the operation of the Centre. At this time it has been tentatively planned to set up a committee of teachers representing the schools to aid in the co-ordination of the Centre in governing the operation of the Centre.
Grey County Box 100 Markdale N0C 1H0 R. M. Hall, Director of Education No. of Centres: 0 No. of Centres Planned: 1	Old school abandoned for school use adjacent to board office.	Some from boards & each of GCTA & OSSTF (district offices).	- meeting space - records (files) - display centre, etc.	Probably some appropriate pattern e.g. keys to certain people, booking arrangements, etc.

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es)	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Governance and Administration
Waldman Box 2000 Cayuga N0A 1E0 L. J. Howald, Supt. of Schools Education Services Centre Grant & Ottawa Streets Cayuga No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Film library then video taping, camera and photography, laminating; also an office area for support staff; (consult- ants, psychometrist, remedial reading & speech).	Board budget from elementary & second- ary expenditures.	Teacher work centre, pro- fessional in-service sessions, curriculum meetings.	Publicly funded through education taxes. Staffed by board.
Halton RCSS Box 308 Burlington L7R 3Y2 Miss Kathleen Kenifick, Supt. of Education, Profes- sional & Curriculum Devel- opment Education Resource Centre Halton RCSS Board 102 Drury Lane Burlington No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 1	Supt. of Professional & Curriculum Development initiated the concept of a combined resource centre & meeting room with professional library.	Board financed.	- professional development workshops, make-and-take workshops using equipment & resources made available, previewing of teaching resources. Centre open 1 evening per week.	Resource centre consultant directs the daily activities of the centre; the supt. is responsible for budgeting, staffing, etc. & reports to the Director of Education.
REMARKS: Teachers have been asked to discuss the feasibility of expanding the original centre to a Centre organized by teachers. Activities which might be conducted would be: (i) drop-in for socializing, (ii) open house for teachers new to the system, (iii) guest speakers and/or discussions re religious topics, and (iv) informal professional development sessions.				
Hamilton Box 558 Hamilton L8N 3L1 H. H. Nixon, Assistant to the Director of Education No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Education Centre was opened in 1967. It houses all the adminis- trative offices but it is also oriented to the pro- fessional development of teachers - meeting rooms, educational re- sources, etc. & a library containing 20,000 volumes, as well as films, records, printout facilities - subscribe to over 500 periodicals.	Board financed.		Board administered.
Hamilton-Wentworth RCSS 90 Mulberry Street Hamilton L8N 3R9 John Grosso, Staff Develop- ment Officer 1. Learning Materials Centre 398 King Street West Hamilton 2. Mount Mary Immaculate Academy Ancaster No. of Centres: 2 No. of Centres Planned: 0	In both cases private schools which had closed down. One was pur- chased & the second rented by the board.	Totally board fin- anced.	Winter course locations. Professional development activities of all kinds. TV productions; work- shop activities.	Under general direction of a superintendent.
Hastings County 156 Ann Street Belleville K8N 3L3 E. G. Runacres, Director of Education 1. Education Centre 156 Ann Street Belleville 2. Bancroft Area IMC Office Box 160 Bancroft No. of Centres: 2 No. of Centres Planned: 0	The one at the Education Centre serves the media resource & in-service accommodation needs of staff throughout the entire system. The Centre in North Hastings was established as a media resource centre for teachers in the north- ern geographical area of the system.	The personnel are financed from the system budget, along with basic equipment & operating expenses. Supplies for teacher preparation & pro- cessing of instruction- al materials in excess of \$3.00 are charged back to the schools.	- professional development activities - leadership personnel training - teacher committee & task force activities - preparation of resource materials - distribution, repair & maintenance of school equipment	Re: Professional Develop- ment - reservations & planning are made through the receptionist who co- ordinates all bookings; Re: Resource & Media Needs - co-ordinators in each location are respon- sible for the effective functioning of the centre.
Hastings-Prince Edward County RCSS 158 George Street Belleville K8N 3H3 D. S. O'Sullivan, Supt. of Education No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0		Board financed.	In-service or group meet- ings, interest groups, make and take materials, film/video resource, etc.	Primary Resource Teacher and teachers.
Kenora Box 1270 Kenora P9N 3X7 D. K. Hay, Director of	Originated by the board.	Board financed.	Materials collections; pro- fessional books; filmstrips; AV material & equipment.	Under control of Learning Material Resource Co-or- dinator.

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es) Education	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Governance and Administration
Learning Materials Resource Centre Box 1270 Kenora Mrs. P. Wyder, Subject Chairman No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0				
Kenora RCSS 200 First Street North Kenora P9N 2K4 Mrs. Wanda Perozik St. Mary's School Kenora No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	In the fall of 1973 a need was recognized for a place where teachers could meet & where professional materials could be centralized.	Board financed.	- sessions in art, outdoor education, music are held - workshops for teachers - staff in-service sessions - grade level meetings - invitations for many of the sessions were extended to include the non-teaching personnel in the system, teacher aides, etc.	Co-ordinated and/or planned by a teacher who is also responsible for program development in the system. It is also his responsibility to add to the resource materials available at the Centre.
Kent County 93 William Street North Chatham N7M 5L7 N. F. Hodgson, Supt. of Education Learning Materials Centre Kent County Board of Ed. 102 Taylor Avenue Chatham N7L 2T8 No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Started as a county wide need in 1969-70 for both public & separate schools.	Funded by public and separate school boards on a 80-20 basis.	Films, reproduction of materials, teacher workshops.	1 supervisor of learning materials & 1 superintendent who reports to boards.
Kirkland Lake Box 610 Kirkland Lake P2N 3J9 Michael Barnes, Principal Queen Elizabeth P. S. 1. Queen Elizabeth P. S. Poplar Avenue Kirkland Lake 2. c/o Paul Bourassa Kirkland Lake Bd. of Ed. 8 Al Wende Drive Kirkland Lake P2N 3J9 No. of Centres: 2 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Lynn Sauer & Doug Hartley, consultants, started project. In co-operation with Michael Barnes, plus board approval, project under way in 2 rooms in a large JK-6 public school. One wall knocked out to give large open area.	Small teacher centre for French only at board office (financed by French consultant). Large one financed by L. Sauer & D. Hartley and special fund of Director of Ed.	Meetings, preparation of materials for teaching, permanent & moveable displays, layout, also for display & workshops, circular 14, 15 materials, etc.	Principal is responsible for building; consultants for the layout, also for display & general operation of area.
Lambton County 190 Wellington Street Sarnia N7T 7L2 W. C. Blake, Supt. of Program Education Centre 811 London Road Sarnia No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Old school remodelled as A. V. support staff centre by board on recommendation of administration.	Board financed.	A. V. Centre - production facilities for wide range of A. V. materials; Film Library - preview facilities, camera studio & dark room; Support staff - kits & materials for teachers, office for support staff.	Superintendent of Program with input from support staff, A. V. committee, principals' councils, teachers, etc.
Lennox & Addington County Box 70 Napanea K7R 3M1 J. C. McLeod Camden East School Camden East K0K 1J0 No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	It came about with the closing of 2 rooms of a 3-room elementary school.	Financed out of current funds of the board.	It houses 3 resource teachers who collect teaching resource materials for the county.	It is organized by the resource teachers. The control rests with them through a Superintendent of Schools.
London & Middlesex RCSS 401 Queens Avenue London N6A 4X5 R. O'Neill, Supt. of Education No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 1	Arose from need to develop new role-image for teachers in new program & to feed in information on methods, materials.	Board financed.	Consultative, professional development, mutual support.	Under control of Primary Co-ordinator.
Metro Separate School Bd. 146-150 Laird Drive Toronto M4G 3V8 Edward J. Moore, Asst. Supt. of Curriculum 1. Region #1 396 Spring Garden Avenue	The centres are basically resource centres established in each area office. They are organized by division and by specialist subject - Primary Education, Junior Education,	Centres are funded by the Region - using per capita allocation; under the direction of the Superintendent.	Religious Education Centre, A. V. Centre - resource centres for Primary & Jr. Education, Art centres, Music centres; various activity centres where teachers can meet.	Centres are under the direction of the Regional Supt. General administration is by the assigned resource staff. There are no Teacher Centres resembling the British model - although

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es)	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Governance and Administration
Willowdale M2N 3H5 2. Region #2 126 Rathburn Road Islington M9B 2K6 3. Region #3 69 Bond Street Toronto M5B 1X4 4. Region #4 349 Brock Avenue Toronto M6H 3N4 No. of Centres: 4 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Art, Religious Education, etc.			this type of centre is now under investigation.
Middlesex County Hyde Park NOM 1Z0 J. W. Roper, Supt. of Instruction Teacher Centre The Middlesex County Bd. of Education Hyde Park NOM 1Z0 No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	During the fall of 1973, the Resource Staff pre- sented a proposal to the Executive Council for the establishment of a Teacher Centre in res- ponse to requests from elementary school teach- ers for a place to get together to make learn- ing games & materials.	The recommendation of the Executive Coun- cil to establish a Teacher Centre in the board's Learning Materials Centre was approved by the board and money included in the 1974 budget for the construction of a work area, for storage & display units & for supplies. The FWTAO donated a cutting board to the Centre in 1974. The 1975 board budget included a dry mount press for the Centre. Both the 1975 & 1976 budgets included an amount for supplies for the Centres.	Making of learning games and materials by teachers visiting the Centre.	Resource teachers are always present to assist teachers who visit the Centre on the 1 evening scheduled each week or at other times at the teacher's personal request & by appointment.
Niagara South 250 Thorold Road West Welland Dean Culliford, Supt. of Schools Welland Teacher Centre c/o First Street School First Street Welland No. of Centres: 0 No. of Centres Planned: 1	Impetus came from 2 teachers & a principal who visited a Centre in another board. Organi- zed a committee & gained support from teachers, principals, administra- tors & board.	Schools in Welland contribute to operat- ing costs from school budgets. Ministry of Education will pro- vide money for in- service sessions from regional PD fund (\$800 maximum).	To be an "idea centre" - displays of texts, A. V. material, project ideas, meeting centre for in-ser- vice, place for visiting "experts" to meet small groups of teachers - "make and take" place.	Tentatively - committee composed of 1 representa- tive from each school to operate centre & give major thrust for activities - many retired teachers have offer- ed volunteer assistance in operation of Centre.
Nipissing 269 Main Street West North Bay R. K. Wilson, Supt. of Schools Learning Materials Centre King George Public School Harvey Street North Bay No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Established as a Learn- ing Materials Centre.	Board financed.	Teachers prepare materials for classroom use and lesson preparations.	Operation is under the sup- ervision of a consultant, assisted by a technician & a secretary, & is respons- ible to the Supt. of Curric- ulum.
North York 5050 Yonge Street Willowdale M2N 5N8 W. F. Lavender, Supt. of Professional Development 1. Professional Development Centre 100 Dalemout Avenue Toronto M6B 3C9 2. Media Services Saranac Annex 3174 Bathurst Street Toronto M6A 2A9 3. Armour Heights Centre 148 Wilson Avenue Toronto M5M 3A5 4. Gulfstream Centre 20 Gulfstream Road Weston M9M 1B3 5. Lamberton Centre 33 Lamberton Boulevard Downsview M3J 1G6	The first Teacher Centre originated through the efforts of the Supt. of Professional Develop- ment. It is located in a wing of one of the elem- entary schools & consists of a number of seminar & conference rooms. 5 Centres which are located in 5 elementary schools throughout the system were planned by the Asst. Supt. of Schools in con- sultation with resource teachers. One addition- al Centre was planned by the Co-ordinator of Media Services & staff.	Funds are provided annually by the board of education for the maintenance of the Centres.	- professional growth pro- grams - conferences, seminars & workshops; - curriculum planning - materials examination & loan centre; - focal point for consulta- tive staffs.	Professional Development Centre is the responsibility of the Supt. of Professional Development. Materials Examination Centre is ad- ministered by the Co-ordin- ator of Media Services. 5 Teacher Centres are ad- ministered co-operatively by Asst. Supts. of Schools & Program Leaders.

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es)	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Governance and Administration
6. Lillian Centre 1059 Lillian Street Willowdale M2M 3G1 7. Rippleton Centre 21 Rippleton Road Don Mills M3B 1H4 No. of Centres: 7 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Superintendent's suggestion to a consultant to make use of 4 empty rooms in a school. Others followed suit with formation of a Primary Task force. First organization using "junk" furniture and much paint, done by Resource Persons.	Superintendent's budget - amounts differ but very little money available. Volunteers helped at first, some secretarial assistance now.	In-service - individual & group Program Planning. Idea rooms - changed every few months, teachers share in displays & come for ideas. Demonstration classes nearby. Bulletins prepared regularly. Book displays.	Primary Consultants and Resource Teachers (home base at Teacher Centre). Teacher Centre representative in each school is liaison for ideas, requests, suggestions. Bulletin prepared by teachers.
Peel 90 Dundas Street West Mississauga L5B 1H5 Mrs. Doris Paton, Co-ordinator, Primary/Jr. Ed. 1. Teacher Centre c/o Beatty Fleming P.S. 26 Campbell Drive Brampton 2. Teacher Centre c/o Lyndwood P.S. 498 Hartsdale Avenue Mississauga 3. Teacher Centre c/o Indian Road Field Office 1313 Indian Road Mississauga 4. Teacher Centre c/o Earncliffe P.S. 50 Earncliffe Circle Brampton No. of Centres: 4 No. of Centres Planned: 0				
Sarnia & District Crippled Children's Treatment Centre 1240 Murphy Road Sarnia Margaret Elaine Jones, Teacher No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 1	We have been involved in Blissymbolics Communication from the early stages in development. Presently we are under a legal contract with BCF approval to function as a Resource Centre.	The fees are set by the BCF in Toronto and are sufficient to operate the workshop.	Instruction to prepare others attending to set up Bliss instruction programs for their students, consultant services, & presentations for public information.	This is not at a formal level at present & functions under the expertise of therapy departments as well as education. There is a date set for Sept. '76 at which time programs will be more formalized in structure.
Timmins RCSS 36 Birch Street South Timmins Ernest Baribeau, Director of Education No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Desire for centralized resources & services, such as a book, film & A.V. software library, a closed circuit TV centre, a production workshop & meeting room.	The Centre presents its budget to the board for approval.	All types of printing & reproduction. Variety of A.V. aids, closed circuit TV, recording and broadcasting live or canned.	Teachers, formal meetings. The Director & his assistant are teachers' remote supervision by a superintendent from main office.
Toronto 155 College Street Toronto M5T 1P6 William J. Quinn, Supt. for Area 6 1. (for Areas 1 and 2) Book Centre General Consultant Area 1 Office Howard P.S. 30 Marmaduke Street Toronto M6R 1T2 2. (for Areas 3 and 6) Underground Attic General Consultant Area 6 Office John Fisher P.S. 40 Erskine Avenue Toronto M4P 1Y2 3. (for Areas 4 and 5) Book Mart General Consultant Area 4 Office Rose Avenue P.S. 675 Ontario Street Toronto M4X 1N4 No. of Centres: 3 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Area consultants established the Centres with the help of publishers as a service to teachers & principals.	Financed largely by publishers.	A permanent display of current teaching materials, books, etc. - a place for teachers to meet and discuss these materials with consultants & one another - a place to plan Professional Activities.	Consultants manage the day-to-day operation. Professional Activity Committees of teachers, principals, consultants in co-operation with Area Superintendent plan Professional Activities.

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es)	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Governance and Administration
Wellington County 500 Victoria Road North Guelph N1E 6K2 D. E. Long, Supt. of Schools No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 0	A new building was constructed to accommodate all board of education functions - warehouse, maintenance, business, consultants, administrative team, etc. Plans included a professional library, television studio and teachers' workroom.	Public funds obtained through Ministry grants & municipal tax dollars as part of the total board budget. Specifically, the centre is budgeted for by the 2 media consultants.	Review of material: Library print & non-print materials, TV tapes, 16 mm films, simulation games & other instruction kits - taping of TV programs - planning workshop activities such as copy of tapes, copy of slides, making slides of pictures, all normal copy processes from sets of materials in master file plus sign making & poster making activities, etc. - essentially a teacher workshop.	Through the Supt. of Educational Services, the general operation is effected by the 2 media consultants - Library & TV. The centre is open each day from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. & 2 evenings until 8:30 p.m.
Windsor RCSS 1485 Janette Avenue Windsor N8X 1Z2 Mrs. Nancy Murray, Head Consultant, Teacher Centre No. of Centres: 2 No. of Centres Planned: 0	The Windsor RCSS Board Teacher Centre was an outgrowth of services rendered by the Curriculum Materials Dept. Originally housed in a vacant residential dwelling, this dept. operated the film loan collection, the professional library & the learning materials in the display collection. When the main administrative offices were planned, the concept of the Teacher Centre for the staff of the board was examined. Space on the 2nd floor of the board was allocated including provisions for a demonstration classroom, seminar room, film previewing services, a work area, reading room, production facilities, film storage & distribution. The Centre was to serve all staff & all materials for all central office personnel would be centrally organized, distributed & purchased.	Generally, the financing of the Teacher Centre has been from the general funds of the Windsor RCSS Bd. Some aspects of the programming which emanates from the Teacher Centre have been co-operatively financed by the Windsor RCSS Bd. & local OECTA unit. A special grant of the board & OECTA to the Teacher Centre Committee was utilized to operate the minicourse in-service program in 1974.	Teachers may drop in to borrow books, tapes, kits, films, etc. any time. "Make 'n take" on a do-it-yourself basis is popular as are demonstration sessions on "how to" construct games, charts, etc. A games bank is available for teachers to copy. Assignment cards, 11,000 35 mm slides, phonograph records, commercial instructional programs, thematic units designed by board teachers can be borrowed or in some cases duplicated. The display collection of new materials is updated annually. 1/3 of the collection is added each yr. & 1/3 deleted. The materials removed from the Teacher Centre are sent to schools with special needs or to a new school. The new titles added each year form the basis of workshops & are borrowed by consultants & teachers. They then become recommendations for individual schools to purchase for local school resource centres. All materials are free to board teachers & at present there is no limit placed on the quantity of materials used. Workshops take place on a planned basis by the consultative staff. Teachers too initiate discussion sessions & production sessions at the Centre. A guitar club of the board meets weekly. The Teacher Centre is open Monday, Tues., & Thurs. til 6:00 p.m.; Wed. til 9:00 p.m.; Fri. til 5:00 p.m. & Sat. from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. A newsletter entitled "IT" circulates to board personnel announcing activities, materials, etc.	Under the direction of the Curriculum Materials Department of the Windsor RCSS Board.
York 2 Trethewey Drive Toronto M6M 4A8 D. J. Phillips, Supt. of Program & Community Affairs 1. Science D. B. Hood Jr. P.S. 2327 Dufferin Street Toronto 2. Mathematics Silverthorn Jr. P.S. 55 Ypres Road	As a result of subject co-ordinators' needs assessment. There are 3 centres - one for Science, 1 for Math & 1 for Language Arts.	They are financed through the professional development program.	A resource centre for display of materials for teachers & a centre for workshops appropriate to the subject area.	The Centres fall under the jurisdiction of the professional development program. The co-ordinator is responsible for the program & displays in the Centre in conjunction with the Supt. of Program.

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es)	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Goverance and Administration
Toronto 3. Language Arts Roseland Jr. P.S. 990 Jane Street Toronto No. of Centres: 3 No. of Centres Planned: 2				
York Region RCSS 21 Dunlop Street Richmond Hill L4C 2M6 F. S. Bobsich, Supt. of Education Teacher Centre c/o Our Lady Help of Christians School 10568 Bayview Avenue Richmond Hill No. of Centres: 1 No. of Centres Planned: 1	The idea was originally pushed by Primary Ed. Consultant & Supt. of Ed. Converted an extra classroom in 1 of our schools to serve as a resource and meeting centre in 1975.	Financed out of current funds, i.e. we budget for it on an annual basis.	Meetings - curriculum, principals' association, OECTA; Workshops. Good work area for consultants & curriculum committees - laminating services.	Administered by Supt. of Education; looked after by consultants and consultants' secretary who works in the adjacent room. Some clerical aspects looked after by a part time person who also does 3 days per week of laminating at the Teacher Centre.

BOARDS WITH RESOURCE CENTRES

Haldimand-Norfolk RCSS P. O. Box 278, Park Road Simcoe N3Y 4L1 L. L. Begley, Director of Education No. of Centres: 0* No. of Centres Planned: 0 REMARKS: *Centre closed June 30, 1975 due to infrequent use. Possible reasons were wide spread system and resource centre relatively inaccessible to many teachers. Also most teachers in a young staff (average age 30) taking university courses during the school year.	Classroom in St. John's School, Delhi, set aside for a Teacher Centre.	Board financed.	Resource centre with wide variety of supplementary materials organized by primary, junior & intermediate divisions. Teachers encouraged to research material, prepare concrete assignment materials, get together to compare notes or just chat. Some in-service by resource people from within the system.	Teacher Centre was supervised by either the Curriculum Co-ordinator or Primary Consultant on certain specified evenings during the week from 4:30-9:00 p.m.
Ottawa 330 Gilmour Street Ottawa K2P 0P9 J. E. Sutherland, Supt. of Program No. of Centres: 0 No. of Centres Planned: 0	We operate resource centres for teachers: Primary Resource Centre, French Resource Centre, etc.	These are the responsibility of the consultants of the subject areas involved. No special budget is assigned.	Consultants use these locations for meetings & work rooms for teachers. Our primary resource centre houses many examples of good concrete material that teachers often copy &/or adapt to their own needs.	Board administered.
Sudbury 130 Drinkwater Street Sudbury P3E 3E1 W. N. Roman, Supt. of Program No. of Centres: 0 No. of Centres Planned: 0	We have 3 Resource Centres out of which operate Resource Personnel - the consultants do have materials, etc. available to school staffs. We have a large media centre serving all of our elementary & secondary schools.	Board financed.	Certain empty rooms are utilized by school staff and resource consultants for subject materials, e.g. math - Jr. consultants K-6 - music, with materials available to teachers as they visit.	Board administered.
Waterloo County Corporation Square Duke & Ontario Streets Box 68 Kitchener N2H 3W5 No. of Centres: 0 No. of Centres Planned: 0	Originated with the board.	Board financed.	Covers areas - Primary, Science, Mathematics, Environmental Studies, Play Environments, Physical Education, Art, Music, Special Education, ETV, Outdoor Education.	Board administered.
1. Learning Resources Centre Victoria School Joseph Street Kitchener 2. Learning Resource Mobile Centre (scheduled for various periods in several geographic locations) 3. Primary Resource Centre Sheppard Public School Weber Street East Kitchener 4. Science & Mathematics Resource Centre Elizabeth Ziegler Public School Moore Avenue Waterloo 5. Environmental Studies (Geography & History) Resource Centre Prueter Public School Prueter Avenue Kitchener 6. Play Environments Centre Prueter Public School Prueter Avenue Kitchener			7. Physical Education Resource Centre Sheppard Public School Weber Street East Kitchener 8. Art & Music Resource Centres Board Office Box 68 Kitchener 9. Special Education Resource Centre (Including Remedial) Victoria School Joseph Street Kitchener 10. ETV Centre Nine Pines School Ottawa Street South Kitchener 11. Outdoor Education Centres: (a) Blair Village School, R.R. #3, Cambridge (Preston) (b) Wrigley Corners School, R.R. #2, Ayr (c) Laurel Creek Conservation Area (to be completed in the fall of 1976)	

School Board Contact Person Centre(s) Address(es)	Origin of Centre	Financing	Main Activities	Governance and Administration
York County Box 40 Aurora L4G 3H2 S. L. G. Chapman, Director of Education No. of Centres: 0 No. of Centres Planned: 0	17 permanent curriculum committees with volun- tary participation open to all teachers were initiat- ed by the board & serve some functions of Teach- er Centres.	Board financed.	K-13 interaction subject & division content, evaluation of students, reporting to parents, study of proposed courses & existing guide- lines, examination of mater- ials, advising on equipment, school year, etc.	School board directed but committees elect their own chairmen.

LIST OF SCHOOL BOARDS REPORTING NO TEACHER CENTRE

Airly DSA	Hearst	Nipigon-Red Rock	Sudbury DRCS
Asquith & Garvey DSA	Hearst DRCS	Nipissing DRCS	Sultan RCSS
Bicknell DSA	Hornepayne	Norfolk	Timiskaming
Borden CFB	Hornepayne RCSS	North Bay CFB	Timiskaming RCSS
Brant County	Huron County	North of Superior DRCS	Timmins
Bruce-Grey RCSS	Huron-Perth County RCSS	North Shore	Trenton CFB
Canfield DSA	James Bay Lowlands Secondary	North Shore DRCS	Victoria County
Caramat DSA	Kapuskasing	Northumberland & Newcastle	Waterloo County RCSS
Carleton	Kapuskasing DRCS	Ottawa CFB	Waterloo N. Children's Centre
Carleton RCSS	Kashabowie DSA	Ottawa RCSS	Welland County RCSS
Central Algoma	Kirkland Lake RCSS	Oxford County	Wellington County RCSS
Chapleau, Panet, Twp 13G DRCS	Lakehead	Oxford County RCSS	West Parry Sound
Cochrane-Iroquois Falls DRCS	Lake Superior	Penetanguishene Protestant SS	White Otter DSA
Dryden DRCS	Lambton County RCSS	Perth County	Windsor
Dufferin County	Lanark County	Petauawa CFB	Windsor Red Cross
Durham	Lanark, Leeds & Grenville County RCSS	Peterborough-Victoria- Northumberland-Newcastle RCSS	
Durham RCSS	Leeds & Grenville County	Pinard	
East Parry Sound	Lincoln County	Prescott-Russell County	
East York	Lincoln County RCSS	Prescott-Russell County RCSS	
Elgin County RCSS	London	Prince Edward County	
Espanola	Manitoulin	Red Lake RCSS	
Essex County	Michipicoten	Renfrew County	
Essex County RCSS	Michipicoten DRCS	Renfrew County RCSS	
Falconbridge CFB	Mine Centre DSA	Sault Ste. Marie	
Foleyet RCSS #1	Missarenda DSA	Sault Ste. Marie DRCS	
Fort Frances-Rainy River	Moose Factory Island	Savant Lake DSA	
Fort Frances-Rainy River RCSS	Moosonee DSA	Scarborough	
Fort Henry CFB	Moosonee RCSS	Simcoe County	
Geraldton	Muskoka	Simcoe County RCSS	
Gogama RCSS	Nakina DSA	Smoky Falls DSA	
Haliburton County		Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry RCSS	
Halton			

LIST OF SCHOOL BOARDS THAT DID NOT RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE

Allanwater DSA	Elgin County	London District Crippled	Red Lake
Armstrong DSA	Ferland DSA	Children's Centre	St. Julien, SS #1
Atikokan RCSS	Foleyet DSA	Metropolitan Toronto	Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry County
Auden DSA	Frontenac County	Mill-Forest DSA	Dubreuilville RCSS
Brant County RCSS	Geraldton DRCS	Murchison & Lyell DSA	Umfreville DSA
Bruce County	Gogama DSA	Oba DSA	Upsala DSA
Chapleau	Grattan Protestant SS	Ontario Crippled Children's Centre	Variety Village
Connell & Ponsford DSA	Kent County RCSS	Oshawa Cerebral Palsy Centre	Wentworth County
Dent DSA	Lakehead DRCS	Peterborough County	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnold, R. "A Centre in Britain." Trends in Education 23 (July 1971): 42-5
- Bailey, Stephen K. "Teachers' Centers: A British First." Phil Delta Kappan 53 (November 1971): 146-9.
- Batten, John. "In-Service Education in Teachers' Centres: A Suggested Approach." Journal of Curriculum Studies 5 (May 1973): 25-31
- Bell, Harry and Peightel, John W. Teacher Centers and In-service Education. Bloomington, Ind.: Phil Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1976.
- Bender, Albert E. "Centers for Teachers: England and the U.S.A." Oregon ASCD Curriculum Bulletin (September 1975) (ED 113 328)
- Beresford, Charles. "Teachers' Centres Processes and In-Service Opportunities." Cambridge Journal of Education 4 (No. 2 Easter): 93-101
- Blishen, Edward, ed. Encyclopedia of Education. New York: Philosophical Library, 1970.
- Bradley, Howard; Flood, Pamela; and Padfield, Tony. "What Do We Want For Teachers' Centres?" British Journal of In-Service Education 1 (Summer 1975): 41-8
- Burrell, D. "Teacher Center: A Critical Analysis." Educational Leadership 33 (March 1976): 422-7
- Buxton, Amity B. "Teachers Active Learning Center (TALC): A Case Study." Educational Leadership 33 (March 1976): 428-33
- Chittenden, E. et al. First Year Evaluative Study of the Workshop Center for Open Education. New York: Workshop Center for Open Education, City College of New York, 1973.
- Collins, James F. "The Making of a Teaching Center." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974): 13-19
- Crosby, J. Michael. "A Teacher Looks at Teaching Centers and Educational Reform." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974): 31-36
- Crum, Mary F., ed. Teachers Centers. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, March 1977. Bibliographies of Educational Topics No. 6. (ED 134 556)

- Davis, John B. "The Teacher Center as a Strategy for Local School Renewal." Statement before the National Institute of Education Panel at the American Association of School Administrators Convention, Dallas, Texas, Feb. 24 1975. (ED 108 381)
- Devaney, Kathleen and Thorn, Lorraine. Exploring Teachers' Centers. San Francisco, Calif.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975 (ED 107 601)
- Devaney, Kathleen. "What's a Teachers' Center For?" Educational Leadership 33 (March 1976): 422-7
- DeVault, M. Vere. Teacher Centers in Japan, England and the U.S.: A Series of Case Studies. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin, Jan. 1974a (ED 093 856)
- DeVault, M. Vere. "Teacher Centers: An International Concept." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974b): 37-9
- Dhance, Harry and Murphy, Michael J. "A Case for Teachers' Centres." Education Canada 17 (Fall 1977): 18-21
- Eddy, W.P. "How Successful Are the British Teachers' Centres." Educational Leadership 31 (March 1974): 509-11
- Education: A Framework for Expansion. London, England: H.M.S.O., December 1972. (White Paper)
- Feiman, Sharon. Teacher Curriculum Work Center: A Descriptive Study. Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota, Centre for Teaching and Learning, North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation, 1975a
- Feiman, Sharon. "Patterns of Teacher Behavior in a Teacher Center." Interchange 6 (No. 2) 1975b: 56-62
- Feiman, Sharon. "Evaluating Teacher Centers." School Review 85 (May 1977): 395-411
- The Formative Years. Provincial Curriculum Policy for the Primary and Junior Divisions of the Public and Separate Schools of Ontario. (Circular PLJ1) Toronto, Ont.: Ministry of Education, 1975.
- Garnett, Emmeline. Area Resource Centre: An Experiment. London, England: Edward Arnold, 1972.
- Gilchrist, G.E. "Local Support for Innovation." British Journal of Teacher Education 4 (January 1978): 55-67

- Gough, R.G. "Professional Support for the City Teacher." In Teachers' Centres, pp. 113-128. Edited by Robert Thornbury. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.
- Greenwood, Bill. "Regional Curriculum Development Through Local Teachers' Centres - Some Reflections." In Teachers' Centres, pp. 88-112. Edited by Robert Thornbury. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.
- Havelock, Ronald G. "The Utilisation of Educational Research and Development." British Journal of Educational Technology 2 (May 1971): 84-98
- Hubbard, D.N. and Salt, J. "Teachers' Centres - Some Suggestions for a Strategy." Forum 14 (Spring 1972): 63-4
- Hyer, Anna L.; Luke, Robert A.; Knispel, Margaret A.; and Sand, Ole. "Teacher Centers: Involvement of the United States Teaching Profession." n.d. (Mimeographed)
- Inside Out: The Final Report and Recommendations of the Teachers' National Field Task Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1974. (ED 093 863)
- James, Charity. Beyond Customs: An Educator's Journey. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.
- Johnston, David J. "The University Centre for Teachers in Schools and in Institutions of Further Education. A Personal Account." British Journal of In-Service Education 1 (Autumn 1974): 18-23
- Jones, W.A. and Stabler, E. "Memorandum re Visits to North Ealing Teachers' Centre and Enfield Teachers' Centre." Toronto, Ont.: July 26, 1972. (Typewritten)
- Julius, Arline Kahn. "Britain's New Induction Plan for First Year Teachers." Elementary School Journal 76 (March 1976a): 350-57
- Julius, Arline. "British Teacher Centers: Practical Applications for America." Phi Delta Kappan 58 (November 1976b): 250-53
- Kahn, Harry. "Teachers' Centres as Agencies for Change." Ideas 23 (October 1972): 11-16
- Kahn, Harry. "The New Professionals." In Teachers' Centres, pp. 66-87. Edited by Robert Thornbury. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.

- Kahn, H. "Save Our Teachers' Centres." Times Educational Supplement 3148 (October 3 1975): 2
- Kahn, H. "Role of Teachers' Centres in In-Service Education." Trends in Education 3 (Autumn 1977): 27-31
- Kavanaugh, Frank. "Memo re Teach (sic) Centre - North Eastern Ontario, Timmins." October 13, 1972. (Typewritten)
- Levin, Corinne and Horwitz, Robert. "The Teacher Center, Inc. (New Haven, Conn.): A Case Study." Educational Leadership 33 (March 1976): 434-9
- Lickona, T. and Hasch, P. "Research on Teachers Centers." Educational Leadership 33 (March 1976): 450-5
- McKeegan, Hugh F. "Curriculum Development and In-Service Education at British Teachers' Centers." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association meeting, New York, April, 1977. (ED 137 292)
- Matthews, Geoffrey. "A Beginning of Teachers' Centres." In Teachers' Centres, pp. 49-65. Edited by Robert Thornbury. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.
- Midwinter, Eric. "Teachers' Centres: The Facilitators." British Journal of In-Service Education 1 (Autumn 1977): 10-14.
- Morgan, G.A.V. "Teachers' Centres in Britain." Paper presented to the Ontario Teachers' Association Conference on Teachers' Centres, Toronto, Ont., September 1973
- Mulhern, John D. "An Overview of Teachers' Centres in England and Wales." Paper presented at Teacher Centering: A National Symposium, Washington, D.C., May 23-26, 1976. (ED 127 320)
- Oliver, H.P.H. and Wees, W.R. "The Teachers' Centre." Orbit 4 (December 1973): 3-7
- The Ontario Teachers' Federation. The Current State of Teacher Centre Development in Ontario: The Results of a Survey of All Ontario School Boards Conducted by the Educational Studies Commission of the OTF. Toronto, Ont.: OTF, October 1, 1976.
- Owen, J.G. "Developing Teachers' Centres." Trends in Education No. 28 (October 1972): 2-7
- Pilcher, P.S. "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Phil Delta Kappan 54 (January 1973): 340-3

- Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information." Journal of Teacher Education 23 (Fall 1972): 389-397
- Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Opening Up the View." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974): 52-8
- Prueter, K.F. "A Teacher Centred Approach to Curriculum and Professional Development." Toronto, Ont., 1972. (Typewritten)
- Prueter, K.F. "A Teacher Centred Approach to Curriculum and Professional Development - Paper No. 2." Toronto, Ont., 1972. (Typewritten)
- Prueter, K.F. "The Teacher Centre - A New Development in Ontario." OTF Reporter (Winter 1973): 21-3
- Quinn, Peter. "Structures for Collaboration in Preservice Teacher Education Centers." Phi Delta Kappan 58 (November 1976): 254-55.
- Richards, Colin. "Teachers' Centres - A Primary School View." Trends in Education, No. 25 (January 1972): 31-3
- Rogers, Vincent R. "Why Teachers Centers in the U.S." Educational Leadership 33 (March 1976): 406-409
- Romero, J. Christian and Hierman, Charles E. "The Thrust and Scope of Teacher Centers and the Prospects for Curriculum Improvement." Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, College of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 1976. (ED 121 715)
- Roseveare, Janet. "In-Service Education and the Teachers' Centre in a Country Area." In Teachers' Centres, pp. 129-139. Edited by Robert Thornbury. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.
- Rosner, Benjamin. "The British Teacher Center: A Report on Its Development, Current Operations, Effects and Applicability to Teacher Education in the U.S." ? November 1972. (ED 090 165)
- Ruchkin, J.P. "Teacher Centers: How Does One School-College Collaboration Work?" Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Summer 1974): 170-4.
- Schmieder, Allen A. and Yarger, Sam J. "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974): 5-12

Schools Council Working Paper No. 10. Curriculum Development, Teachers' Groups and Centres. London, England: The Council, 1967

Schools Council Pamphlet No. 6. Teachers' Centres and the Changing Curriculum: A Report on Three National Conferences. London, England: The Council, 1970.

Schools Council Working Paper No. 43. School Resource Centres. London, England: The Council, 1972.

Schools Council Report 1974-75. London, England: The Council, 1975

Secondary School Diploma Requirements (Circular H.S. 1 1977-78). Toronto, Ont.: Ministry of Education, 1977.

Selden, David. "Teachers Centers: Who Should Pay and Who Should Control?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill., April 1974. (ED 090 168)

Self, David. "Can The Centres Held?" Times Educational Supplement 3244 (August 5 1977): 10-11

Skilbeck, M. "School Based Curriculum and Policy." In New Patterns for Teacher Education and Tasks: Teachers as Innovators. Paris: OECD, 1976. (ED 133 313)

Smith, E. Brooks "Partnership in Teacher Education Revisited: Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Fall 1974): 253-5

Smith, Emmitt D. "The State of the States in Teacher Centering." Journal of Teacher Education 25 (Spring 1974): 21-25

Smith, O.B., ed. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Stabler, Ernest. "Teachers' Centres: A Comparative View." Paper presented to Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada, Edmonton, Alberta, June, 1975.

Steinaker, Norman. "Ten Years Hence: The Curriculum Development and Usage Centre." Educational Leadership 33 (March 1976): 447-9

Stevens, Auriol. "Centres for Action." Times Educational Supplement 2952 (December 17, 1971): 14, 31

- Stevens, Auriol and Cohen, Stephen. "James Rides Again." Times Educational Supplement 3186 (June 25, 1976): 8-9
- Taylor, L.C. "Teachers' Centres - Some Reflections on the British Experience." In New Patterns in Teacher Education and Tasks: Teachers as Innovators. Paris: OECD, 1976. (ED 133 313)
- Teacher Education and Training: Report by a Committee of Inquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science Under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. London, England: H.M.S.O., 1972.
- Teachers' Centres: A Survey of Centre Resources and Conditions of Service of Leaders. London: National Union of Teachers, March 1972
- Thompson, Ethel M. "Teachers' Centres: Why They Were Established by Local Education Authorities Instead of Institutes of Education." Durham Research Review 6 (Autumn 1972): 678-89
- Thornbury, R. "Powerhouses or Postboxes - Teachers' Centres." Times Educational Supplement 2037 (June 1, 1973): 2
- Thornbury, Robert, ed. Teachers' Centres. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.
- "Up On Centres, Down on Quality." Times Educational Supplement 3147 (September 26, 1975): 15
- Van Fleet, Alanson A. "Florida's Teacher Centers: How Teachers Are Involved and What They are Saying." High School Journal 60 (October 1976): 26-31
- Van Fleet, A.A. "Teacher Centers in Florida: A Case Study." School Review 85 (May 1977): 412-24
- Walton, Jack. "Teachers' Centres: Their Role and Function." Forum 15 (Autum 1972): 15-17
- Wees, W.R. "Continuing Education for Teachers: Teachers' Centres." Toronto, Ont.: September 1972. (Mimeographed)
- Wells, Thomas L. "Memorandum re Curriculum Development at the Local Level." Toronto, Ont.: Ministry of Education, Jan. 19, 1977. (1976-77:23)
- Yarger, Sam et al. A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement in American Education. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, New York School of Education, June, 1974. (ED 048 159)